

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1876.

I.—HOW TO REACH A HIGHER SPIRITUAL LIFE.

THE recent General Convention of the Disciples of Christ recommended that, in view of the confessedly low condition of spiritual life in the Church, and the headlong sinning of the world, a special effort be made at once, by all the Churches and by all the ministry, to break the spell of worldliness, to arouse the conscience, and to restore the spirit and power of apostolic times. That secularism is invading the vital powers of the Church, and that an immovable indifference to the preaching of the Gospel is increasing among sinners of all classes, are the deep convictions of all who are praying for the conversion of the world. Men of all denominations are deploring the want of power to reach the conscience, to convince the world of sin, and to make the people glad of the offer of salvation. "Science, falsely so-called," is supplanting revelation in the minds of many of the most cultured; false philosophies as to the "fatherhood of God" over all, both good and bad, and as to the eternal consequences of sin, are ruling the middle classes; while costly chapels, written sermons, and cold formalities are keeping the poor away from the house of God. A half-hearted ministry and a diluted Gospel are the chief causes of these decadences. Nothing plainer can come before any discerning mind than that the ministry are not meeting the heart-wants of mankind either in the Church or out of it. Members are not realizing what

they were promised in obedience to the Word. Their incipient joys are allowed to die out for want of pastoral care, and the doleful song comes home to them, "Where is the blessedness I knew when first I sought the Lord?" Dull or speculative sermons, always failing to edify, absence from church, continued neglect of semi-religious pastors, and, finally, the cessation of secret prayer, complete the destruction of spiritual life, and inaugurate a reign of doubt and unrest of soul, the end whereof is death. As for the world, there is no "*fear* of God before their eyes," and very little in the preaching to create it. As "the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," it is difficult nowadays to make any one "*wise unto salvation*." A damning deficiency is lurking somewhere in the pulpit that is fast discounting its power among men, and depreciating the commonest respect that ought to be entertained for sacred things. To detect this deficiency, and to offer an humble contribution to the proposed general revival of spiritual life, this paper is written. Its contents are commended especially to the Protestant ministry; and although its suggestions may fall far short of their aim, and be very defective in themselves, it is believed that they drive at existing and ruinous evils in the pulpit that must be corrected before the primitive power of the Gospel will again be felt among men. If the sacrifice of the stately Quarterly style be necessary in order to get home some sturdy blows upon the faces of those impudent demons that are trying to drive the Christ out of our pulpits, and out of the world, we shall make no apologies for it. It is the chief folly of some, in their great desire to have things "*Quarterly*," to retain less than a quarter of the Gospel in their sermons. We propose, therefore, to rush upon these pulpit sinners and spare them not. Not that a majority of preachers are culpable, but many of them have been laughed out of some of the most potent sanctions of the Gospel, and are consequently preaching a diluted Gospel, destitute of the very elements that give it respect among men. Few, if any, ministers of the Christian Church are involved in the grosser departures from truth; but many of them fail to "*declare the whole counsel of God*," as will be hereafter shown.

Before beginning to point out the particular sins of the modern Protestant pulpit, it should be noted that, wherever the ancient Gospel is fully preached, with all its divine sanctions, revealing to men their true condition, as ruined by sin, as well as the willingness and power of

Jesus to save all who are weary and heavy laden, the effect is the same as when men "*gladly* received the word"—and not till then were baptized. But there is an undeniable decay of pulpit-power over the conscience of the world, for reasons which we shall now endeavor to detect in some or all of the specifications below :

1. A class of skeptics, represented by O. B. Frothingham, Robert Collier, and others both living and dead, are styled *Reverend*, have churches to preach in, become a sort of pastors, and are ranked by the careless world among ministers of the Gospel, differing from them, it is thought, only as to certain theological questions that fairly lie on debatable ground. But their whole theory of anthropology being false, their theory of Christology is necessarily false. Denying the doctrine of man's fall and sinfulness, they can, of course, have no proper idea of his wants. If the soul is in a healthy normal state, no great Physician was needed ; and, of course, Christ, as a healer, had no errand to this world. Hygiene for the well, and not medicine for the sick, is the sum total of all their lecturing. They never find man in the hospital covered with "wounds and bruises and putrefying sores," or in need of any remedial system whatever. Sin is a mere accident, in no way fatal, and without future consequences. There is no forgiveness—no need of it. Christ was an enthusiast, salvation a conceit, and hell a myth. Sin cures itself like a wound in the flesh, the atonement is scoffed at, and the Bible takes rank with the Koran, the Vedas, and other sacred books of the Orient. Christ was a very clever philosopher, a great moralist and teacher, whose *example* is worthy of all imitation, but whose pretended redemption, by his death, was a gratuitous piece of suffering that no one needed. It is plain that one's anthropology controls and defines his Christology. Even Horace, in his "*Ars Poetica*," has taught us that it is both useless and unbecoming to bring a god upon the stage unless there is some part to be acted requiring the presence of a god ; and as the shallow theory requires the help of no one from heaven, of course Jesus Christ was but a man, with no reasonable claims to the reputation of *Savior* of sinners.

These notions of the comparative harmlessness of sin, and all their logical sequences, are supported, more or less, by Universalists, Restorationists, the less orthodox Unitarians, and all skeptics of every grade and name. They are taught in their schools and colleges,

printed in their weeklies and quarterlies, and preached in their pulpits. It lurks in all the teachings both of theological and scientific materialists, has subsidized at least one-half of the secular press, and is stealthily working its way into what is thought to be the orthodox pulpit, in consequence of which the question of future punishment is seldom heard of in our modern theology. *Hell* is an unsavory word; "eternal judgment," "he that believeth not shall be damned," and kindred Scripture phrases are seldom emphasized—or explained, except to explain them away. An unfaithful and cowardly ministry presume to compound with the world and the devil by turning the velvet side of their tongues to these words of God, or by keeping them in the background altogether. Mr. Henry Ward Beecher said, substantially, in a sermon a few years ago that "the doctrines of hell and kindred crudities answered a very good purpose among a rude people of a rude age, but that they are not calculated to do any good in this age of culture." That is it; this puts the gates ajar and lets us see the insidious error doing its work even among Evangelical Churches. Nor is Mr. Beecher alone. Not a few men in the pulpits of all Protestant Churches have so far yielded to the laugh and sneer at "everlasting punishment" as to speak of it apologetically or by some circumlocution that breaks the force of these plain words of the Spirit. Ever since the days of Jonah it has required bold men to announce divine judgments against all evil-doers, and from that day till this there have been men who at their own hazard have run away "from the presence of the Lord," forgetting that they are not responsible for such message, but only for its faithful announcement to the wicked.

Though we can not apologize for any such clerical cowardice, we may here venture to state the outward circumstance that has chiefly contributed to it—a *palpable misrepresentation of God as to the penalty of sin*. The opposers of the doctrine of future punishment set it forth as a purely arbitrary act of the Almighty, for which there is no necessity in the nature of things; as if he could just as well prevent it if he only would, but yet inflicts it merely for wrath and vengeance' sake. It ought to be unnecessary to say that the Bible is not responsible for any such hideous, Moloch representations of our Creator. God can no more prevent *hell* than he can prevent a *bad conscience*. Both are the natural and unavoidable consequences of sin.

No sane man ever charges God with malignant feelings because he has the heart-ache on account of his sins; and hell is but the same principle carried into eternity. God can not, without a miracle, prevent physical pain and constitutional dilapidation in the drunkard, and, perhaps, ought not if he could. He has built up a physical and moral universe on certain righteous principles, which involve pain in every violation of law, and such presentations of the divine character and of the Bible are false and slanderous in the extreme.

Another misrepresentation of the case that has paralyzed the courage of many a preacher in declaring "the whole counsel of God" is the assertion that this life is too brief and insignificant to incur eternal consequences. The principle involved in this objection is that *there should in justice be a certain equality or balance between the time in which one is engaged in committing a sin and the duration of the penalty incurred*, than which it would be difficult to find a philosophy more fallacious. The murderer kills his fellow in a moment. Should he therefore suffer but a moment? Are the consequences to the victim of his hate but momentary? He has not only deprived him of twenty years of his life, but deprived him of them *forever*. Can those twenty years with their golden opportunities *ever* be restored him? Is he not suffering the loss *eternally*? Would it be just for the culprit to suffer only as long as he was plotting and executing the horrible tragedy? This is the kind of justice infidelity would substitute for that of the Bible. The sneaking, insinuating, lying seducer plays upon the confidence and nobler feelings of pure virginity to execute his fiendish purposes, and then laughs at the sorrows and shame of the poor, bedraggled angel whom he has hurled from her holy place, and sent down through a whole life of suffering and shame. If her soul should finally be saved through grace, can he *ever* restore what he has robbed her of even in this life? *Is not the loss to her as endless as eternity?* And yet infidelity whines over the eternal punishment of said scoundrel. The innocent victim must suffer forever, but her vile destroyer must be defended in every Universalist pulpit in the land, in every infidel lecture-room, and in all books and periodicals opposed to the Bible and to the judgments it hurls against "all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." This is a beautiful philosophy to laugh at the Bible, and they are a beautiful set of evangelical preachers who are so paralyzed by it that the pun-

ishment of the wicked is heard of not once a year in the unmanly ministrations of their pulpits. If their hearers are any more than whey-fed, it is because they have heard truth from some one else, who preaches a *Savior* and something *to be saved from*, and not mere sentimentalisms about morality, virtue, transcendentalism, and "true inwardness."

The whole system of reasoning that makes men ashamed of the Bible teaching as to the consequences of sin is utterly fallacious in another respect. If a man die in sixty seconds, he has entered into a *state* from which he can not recover till the resurrection of the dead, if that should be a geological age from the time of his death. There is no relation between the time it required for him to expire and the time he is to continue in death. So, if a soul during its probation on earth should take "pleasure in unrighteousness," and "wax worse and worse" until it becomes "dead to God," no matter how short a time was required for this spiritual suicide, *the deed is done*, and he is spiritually *dead*, and death has no recuperative power to bring its victim back to life. Whatever is dead remains so forever, unless some power shall conquer death. This Jesus Christ proposes to do in this life for every one that will believe on him. "He that believeth on me has passed from death unto life." But if any man elects to live in sin, and die in his sins, knowing that the wages of sin is death, Jesus assures him, "Where I am you can not come." Why can he not "have everlasting life?" Because, while in his spiritual grave, he refused to be raised on resurrection-day. So he "abides in death." It is quite possible in this life for every man to be "risen with Christ;" but there is no promise of a spiritual resurrection after the death of the body. What relation, then, can there be between the time in which a man was killing himself and the time during which he will remain dead? Why compare "this brief existence" with everlasting death? This life is long enough to commit spiritual suicide several times. This brings the soul into a *state* from which there is no recovery after his harvest is past and his Summer ended. After death, "he that is filthy will be filthy still, he that is unjust will be unjust still." Should this be thought unjust, although Scriptural, let it be remembered that in this world we recognize the same principle without complaining of injustice. After fifty years have been spent in building up a good name and a good character, one silly hour can destroy it all,

and inflict a loss that *never* can be regained. Whether he shall finally lose his soul or not, the loss of time, the loss of good influence, the loss of happiness to himself and family can never be restored even in eternity, unless it can be done by the remedial grace of God. He may be called foolish or sinful or merely unfortunate, yet no one ever complains of *the principle* that protracts the sad result. Should any one mentally respond, "It can be borne for a lifetime; but the suspension of eternal consequences upon the action of an hour is unjust and hard to reconcile with our ideas of the goodness of God," let it be remembered that the *principle* is the same in both cases for "he that is unjust in a little is unjust in much." If there is any thing wrong in suspending *eternal* consequences to actions done in time, it is also wrong for consequences to attach to said actions in the least degree unjust. The principle itself must be right in the sight of God, or it could not exist at all. Certain great principles run through and through the spiritual and moral universe, without which there could be no such universe. They are like beams in God's great building, that reach from eternity to eternity; they run from center to circumference, and around the periphery of all things. They are as fixed and indispensable as the laws of astronomy. They are also as inscrutable as the law of gravitation. Where it begins, where it ends, where its home, in what it consists, and what it is are all mysterious to man. If it is a bad law in the handling of worlds and universes as it does, it is bad also while controlling a mote in a sunbeam. If it is bad at all, it is bad all through. And if spiritual death unjustly introduces a soul into a certain state, it is unjust, whether it be for a longer or shorter period. There are principles and laws in Natural Philosophy, in Chemistry, and everywhere in nature, that work out loss to us whenever they are violated, and the loss is always eternal, whether it be a loss of health, of time, of reputation, of character, or of life. All spiritual consequences are also eternal. Although living in time we are not living for time. A man is always happier for having been happy even once, and always more miserable than he would have been for having been miserable once. The only possible exception there could be to this would be found in the redemption of sinners through Jesus Christ, who can bring good out of evil; but skeptics, who deal in nothing higher than mere *law*, have nothing to do with this. We can not lend them any

capital to do business with. If their lamps go out they must "buy for themselves." They can not reject redemption and yet avail themselves of its wonderful prerogatives. Why then abuse the Bible for the doctrine of "everlasting punishment" when every thing is everlasting? It only proves that Book to be thousands of years in advance of all other knowledges as they come up one by one and make their obeisance to the Bible, which was calmly waiting on their tardy growth. It turns out, then, that not only punishment for sin, but every thing else belonging to our immortal nature is eternal, whether it be good or bad.

As sin is the cause of pain both in the natural and spiritual world, it is useless to expect exemption from pain as long as the cause of it remains. "The sting of death is sin," and if this sting remains in the soul a decillion of centuries, pain will still be inevitable. Jesus Christ mercifully proposes to take away sin, and so save the world from hell; but whoever is unwilling for this, must, of necessity, "abide in death." The penalty of sin is logical and unavoidable, and not arbitrary. According to the constitution of things, God can not prevent the consequences of drunkenness, nor debauchery, nor lying, nor fraud, either in this world or the next. He yearns over the sinner desiring his salvation from the sting of death, not willing that any one should perish. Hell and pain are not the work of God, but of sinners themselves, from which the whole system of religion is designed to redeem them. It must be seen, then, that neither God nor his Word are responsible for future punishment, and that it is unreasonable and unjust to hold either of them answerable for the misery of the wicked. And yet, this is the very mistake that makes many an honest minister hesitate to warn sinners of the wrath to come. The true doctrine has been caricatured and ridiculed under these false presentations of it, which some sensible men know not how to answer, until it is seldom heard in Protestant pulpits at all, and a thin, diluted theology, that can not command the heart or rouse the conscience, is the result.

The forces at work to banish the fear of punishment from the world, and its faithful announcement from the pulpit, embrace:

1. An underestimate of the heinousness of sin.
2. The teaching of Universalists, Restorationists, Destructionists.
3. The teaching of scientific materialism.

4. The soul's revolt against the misrepresentations of the doctrine as above exposed, for which many suppose the Bible to be responsible.

5. A culpable ministerial weakness in declaring unpleasant truths, and in yielding to the current demand for the "prophesying of good things."

The result is, as it was in the days of Charles the Second, and in the French Revolution, when the same sentiment temporarily prevailed—a headlong tumble into utter godlessness, with "no fear of God before their eyes." And so it will ever be when men assume to know more about sin and its curse than the Bible knows, and substitute their own foolish sentimentalisms for the wisdom of God.

This mode of warfare upon the Church is exceedingly ingenious, and must be numbered among the "wiles of the devil." "We are not ignorant of his devices." To flatter the human heart with a notion of its own comparative innocence and independence of mercy is much easier than to set aside the evidence of the divinity of Jesus Christ, who can well be dispensed with if there are no sins to be forgiven. He came to seek and to save the lost; but if a skeptical philosophy can show that none are lost, his presence in this world was a mistake. If Christianity consists in mental and moral development, refinement and social culture, regardless of "the remission of sins that are past," or if the world can be made to believe it, they will certainly neglect the Gospel of Christ, which requires unwelcome contrition for sin, self-abasement and acceptance of mercy at the hand of God. Such is the plan of the enemy to convince us that the doctrine of *salvation* is an absurdity, the sufferings of Christ a gratuity, and concern for the conversion of sinners a piece of feebleness and folly. The Scriptures say, "*He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.*" Not he that pays his honest debts, is kind to the poor, and lives a moral life; but he that confesses his sins to God and accepts of the above conditions, of *forgiveness*. "In Him we have redemption through his blood, even the *forgiveness of sins.*" "Repent ye, therefore, and turn to God, that your *sins may be blotted out.*" Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ *for the remission of your sins.*" "Him hath God exalted to be a Prince and a Savior to grant repentance and *remission of sins.*" "To Him give all the Prophets witness that through his name whosoever believeth in Him shall *receive remission of sins.*" This is what God

meant when he "preached before the Gospel to Abraham saying, 'In thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed;'" as is shown by Peter when he said, "Unto you first God having raised up his Son sent him to *bless* you." How was he to bless all the families of the earth? "In turning away every one of them *from their iniquities.*" But the preaching of *forgiveness, pardon, redemption, blotting out of sin* is to an alarming extent dropped out of the modern pulpit; while kindness to the poor, honesty in business, good character and culture of the moral sentiments have been substituted in its stead. A criminal on his way to the gallows needs executive clemency, governmental *forgiveness*. Should he be pardoned and escape suffocation, he may have time enough afterward to cultivate his moral sentiments and be kind to the poor. The sinner is already condemned, and needs redemption that he may escape the wrath to come, and all preachers who waste the time he ought to be spending in seeking the pardon of his sins by their lectures on "The True, the Beautiful and the Good" are frauds in the pulpit and quacks in the remedial system of Jesus Christ. Palpable as are these frauds upon the perishing souls of the people, they grow directly out of the foregoing errors as to sin and its penalty, which so dilute and cheapen the claims of the Gospel as to make it scarcely worth the preaching. If there is no hereafter to sin, there need be but little concern about it, or repentance, or forgiveness, or the soul, or any thing in the future.

Another danger, to which even the most evangelical minister is exposed, is the cultivation of *legalistic* views in the hearts of sinners in the very act of preaching Christ to them. When trying to draw a clear distinction between morality and Christianity, it is dangerous to say, "Morality is not enough; you must also obey the Gospel." Instead of seeing any *grace* in such an announcement, the unregenerate sees nothing but another work of righteousness which he can add to his present assets. It is with him—Morality plus obedience to the Gospel equal to enough of personal merit to deserve salvation. No wise minister of Christ doubts the tendency of the heart to establish a sort of *quid pro quo* philosophy of salvation, mingling grace and works of merit in that which is wholly of grace. The Catholic teaches that punishment in limbo, purgatory, or hell cleanses from sin; the Restorationist believes the same, while the Universalist would have suffering enough in this life to satisfy all the demands

of justice; but all alike dispense with the mercy of Christ in the *forgiveness* of these sins for which they propose to suffer. It is difficult for the self-righteous and the legalist to accept a gift gracefully. The disposition to earn salvation, or in some way to be independent of mercy and avoid the penitence and confession it involves, is a ruling passion, until contrition and a deep conviction of sin open the way for salvation through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The ability to preach repentance effectually in these days of partial apostasy is by far too rare. Men have abused the mourners' *bench* until sinners have almost ceased to *mourn*; have denounced the heredity of sin until men begin to believe they have no sin of their own. Discarding the wisdom of an apostle in knowing the "terrors of the Lord," and from that conviction persuading men to repent, they have fallen to preaching only the *love* of God, as if there could be any place for redeeming love except on the hypothesis of sin, punishment and ruin. The remedial system sprung out of the woes and future dangers of the soul, and to prate about the love of God while denying the facts that called it forth in Jesus Christ is to trifle with sacred things. "*The depth of the love of God*" reaches down to hell, to save men from which he gave his Son, that whosoever believeth on him might not perish but have everlasting life. *This* is the goodness of God that leads men to repentance.

But, as intimated above, a better class of ministers are evidently failing to meet the heart wants of humanity from an inadequate knowledge of law, sin, penalty and grace. Men are almost naturally legalists. Their great desire is to be justified by the law, by their good conduct, by perfect obedience, or because they have sinned but little. It ought to be urged upon them that the angels in heaven are justified by their law only because they never broke it; that Adam and Eve were in the same way justified by the law during that year or that century before they sinned, and that Jesus Christ was justified by the law, besides which instances we know of no others, and whoever can not truthfully claim the same perfection before the law of God on earth must confess himself a sinner. If a sinner, he must remember that, "*The wages of sin is death*," whether it be sin against natural law, civil law, or spiritual law. Sin is the sting of death which Jesus wishes to extract, and destroy the terror and the power of death. It is useless to tease people about "obeying the Gospel" be-

fore they feel the curse of the law—that “cursed is every one that continues not in *all* things written in the book of the law to do them.” Such shallow teachers soon become disgusting in the eyes of unbelievers, who see no apology for their meddlesomeness. If hydrophobic virus is surely in the veins, you must first convince the patient of that fact, or he will consider your interference the merest quiddling about quidities. And naturally so, for no man has a right to causelessly disturb the peace or to keep bothering people about nothing. An insurance agent urges you to take a policy because there is *danger* of losing your house or of losing your life. Peter on Pentecost, and all the primitive ministry, inspired by the spirit of all wisdom, first sought to convince men of sin before saying a word about obedience; but the modern preacher is wiser, and being either ignorant of the mutual relations of law and Gospel, or ashamed of their awful sanctions, urges the people to repent before showing any good reason why they should. In those days men “gladly received the Word and were baptized.” Nowadays they are coaxed and enticed and begged to “join the Church.” The minister is expected to become a mere soliciting agent at the feet of the wealthy, while the Gospel—the *glorious* Gospel—is made to crawl in the dust, begging for acceptance and support.

If any thing of importance results from the proposed effort at a great “Revival of Spiritual Life” this year, it will depend mainly upon the kind of preaching we are to have. The love of God is the great power that must lead men to renounce their sins, but they must be made to see that this love has reference to their sins and their salvation. The punishment of the wicked should be spoken of tenderly and in sympathy for the sinner, and not as with an appetite for seeing them suffer. In this imitate the Lord Jesus, who so loved us all while in our sins. And when the soul is duly humbled under the mighty hand of God, it will take no exception to the conditions of pardon. Let a work of self-examination begin with the ministry themselves. Let each preacher ask himself whether he really loves sinners and can prayerfully work for their conversion. And like Paul, let him be engaged “night and day praying exceedingly.” Then will he inspire the Church to seek a closer walk with God, and under the power of the Word and Spirit they will go forth together, and cause many to turn to the Lord.

Notwithstanding the evident decline in pulpit power in many professed preachers of the Gospel, it is gratifying to know that thousands are striving to preach Christ faithfully. While some are feeding the people with *whey* these are ministering the "sincere milk of the word" for the young, and "strong meat" for the old. Signs of a speedy return to a sounder theology are not wanting, as the heart yearnings of humanity begin to long after God. The food supplied by false philosophy and by science, falsely so-called, is too poor to satisfy the cravings of the soul.

II.—THE AGES OF NATURE AND THE MOSAIC ACCOUNT

STUDIED UNDER LIGHT OF MODERN SCIENCE.

FAR back in the on-going eons of eternity God uttered the creative fiat, and time began. The absolute date of that beginning is not recorded in the archives of the universe, nor in the book of God's revelation to man; that it antedates the introduction of man upon the earth by vast eras and epochs of time is abundantly attested by the developments of modern science, and nowhere in the book of Revelation is this attestation denied.

To these great volumes—the book of Nature and the Bible—must we appeal for all the knowledge attained or attainable on the grand theme before us. Grand theme, I have called it, because it involves nothing less than the unity and congruity of all divine revelation, the being and attributes of God, adumbrated in the material universe, and declared in the Book of books. Hence, in these days of materialistic tendencies, when the established faith of the Christian seems to be encroached upon by the teachings of modern science, it behooves Christian philosophers to bestir themselves; not only to acquaint themselves with the teachings of the Bible, but to keep pace with the advancements of modern science, the dogmas and teachings of materialistic philosophers, etc., that they may be able to meet the arguments and hypothetical teachings of the infidel in this as well as in other walks of the domain of science.

In view of this state of affairs, I propose to make an humble effort, not to harmonize the teachings of science and the Bible, for they are not at variance; but to contribute something to the general fund, and to make an earnest endeavor to present the truth on the subject in hand. This done, science will be unscathed, the Bible vindicated, and harmony made apparent. The works and Word of God are in perfect accord, but upon this subject of the ages of nature, and the account given by Moses of the creation and making of the heavens and the earth, scientists have essayed to make a conflict, and, in the minds of many, have gained a seeming triumph.

We are told by scientists that "nothing can be more surely established on the basis of scientific induction than the vast length of the periods revealed by the state of the earth's crust." Some geologists are indeed not contented with that enormous stretch of one hundred millions of years, which is regarded as the shortest possible time which may have elapsed since a solid crust first formed on the cooling earth. Moses in his account, says: "For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them is." We now have the two great propositions before us, the one made by the results of modern scientific research, the other by Moses in his account; and here we have the seeming conflict.

We are told by one school of thinkers that the seeming conflict is made to vanish by the touch of the magician's wand, simply by translating the Hebrew word יום (*yom*) day, by the Greek word *æon*, and then use its English equivalent, age. Thus "In six ages of indefinite length God 'created' the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them is." And, in this quotation, they invariably use the word "created;" hence, the unsuspecting reader is misled, from the simple fact that the word is not in the text. But we are told that these are convertible terms—sometimes create is used in the sense of to make, and *vice versa*. Granted. But can not these words be used ambiguously? Certainly they can, and often are. We can ascertain the precise meaning of these words only by a correct interpretation and understanding of the context. In this case it amounts to more than a "*Fallacia equivocationis*," as we will show further on.

I wish to notice, 1. The objections urged by the advocates of the

long period hypothesis, to the six days of Moses; 2. To inquire into the credibility of the two propositions upon which I have based my thesis, and 3. To vindicate the Mosaic account, that, "in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all which is in them."

I will now state briefly the arguments urged by the advocates of the long period hypothesis against the six days of Moses, and discuss them more at length in my second and third propositions.

We are told that the term "the beginning" does not cover the geological ages, because there is no chaotic condition between these and the human period. What is chaos? Webster says chaos is "a confused or disordered mass or state of things." In the discussion of my second proposition, I will endeavor to show, according to the developments of modern science, that the drift or glacial period is the intervening period between the geological ages and the age of man (notwithstanding all that has been said in regard to the antiquity of man), and that it is just such a "state of things" as described by Moses when he said the earth was "desolate and waste." Again, we are told that "the perfectly indefinite phrase, 'in the beginning,' places no limit in backward extension of time to the commencement of God's creative work."

This is perfectly astounding. For the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis contains a series of thoughts, the grandest conceived or conceivable by the human mind. 1. A beginning; 2. Of the heavens and the earth; 3. How they began—by creation; and 4. God is the Creator. Here we have a beginning, and that is certainly, a "limit in the backward extension of time."

In the third place, we are told that the Hebrew word יום (*yom*) does not mean a natural day in Genesis i, 5. This will be examined in the discussion of the third proposition. In the fourth place, we are told that, "Many internal difficulties occur on the hypothesis of natural days." One of these is the "interval which in chapter second appears to have occurred between the creation of the man and that of the woman."

The first verse of the first chapter of Genesis is more suggestive than the whole of its subsequent communications concerning the kingdoms of nature. It assumes the existence of God; for it is he who in the beginning creates. It assumes his eternity; for he is

before all things; and as nothing comes from nothing, he himself must have always been. It implies his omnipotence; for he creates the universe of things. It implies his absolute freedom; for he begins a new course of action. It indicates his infinite wisdom; for a Cosmos, an order of matter and mind, can only come from a being of absolute intelligence. It asserts the creation of the heavens and the earth; that is, of the universe of mind and matter. This creating is the omnipotent act of giving existence to things which before had no existence. And further, it bears on the very face of it the indications that it was written by man and for man, for it divides all things into the heavens and the earth. Such a division evidently suits those only who are inhabitants of the earth. It follows, then, that this sentence is the foundation stone of the history, not of the universe at large, of the sun, or of any other planet, but of the earth, and of man, its rational inhabitant. The primeval events which it records may be far distant, in point of time, from the next event in such a history; as the earth may have existed myriads of ages, and undergone many vicissitudes in its condition, before it became the abode of man.

We have no intimation of the interval of time that elapsed between the beginning of things narrated in this first sentence and that state of things which is recorded in the second verse. The history of the "*one hundred millions of years*," which geologists claim to have elapsed from the beginning of the Cosmos to the introduction of man, is recorded in the everlasting hills, "rock-ribbed and ancient as the sun," written, too, by the finger of Him who doeth all things well, so well, and so complete, that he never repeats the story. Hence, when he vouchsafed to man, through prophets, seers and bards, the Book of books, he directed attention to a higher plane of thought than the physical and geological history of the planet upon which we have our probationary home. The fact that the heavens and the earth were created in the "beginning" by God himself is there recorded because we could find it nowhere else. Then follows a brief sketch of the six days' work in which God refitted the earth for man's abode. In this brief history of the making, molding or refitting the earth for the introduction of man, we see the impress of Omniscience; for it records the beginning of things, which fact can not be learned from the geological history. Man may observe the

laws of nature, and, guided by them, may trace the current of physical events through the distant past and future, but without being able to fix any "limit" to the course of nature in either direction.

In reply to the fourth objection, I will simply say, if the author of the objection had been as thoroughly drilled in Biblical hermeneutics and exegesis as he is in physical science he would never have made the objection. This second chapter is but a repetition of, and a more elaborate account of, the work described in the first chapter. It is occupied with the generations, issues, or products of the skies and the land, or in other words, the things created in the "six days." It records the constitution of man, his moral and intellectual cultivation, and his social perfection. It brings us up to the close of the sixth day. This passage throws a new light on Gen. i, xxvii. It is there stated that man was first created in the image of God, and that he was "created male and female." From this passage we learn that these two acts of creation were distinct in point of time. The one immediately following the other; and for a purpose. First, we see man was really one in his origin, and contained in this unity the perfection of manhood. It does not appear, however that man was so constituted by nature as to throw off another of the same kind by his inherent power—by evolution, as the Darwinians would have it. The narrative is opposed to this view of man's nature; for the change or process by which the woman came into existence is directly ascribed to the Creator. And this, in accordance with the account in the first chapter, we have first the single man created, the full representative and potential fountain of the race, and then, out of the one, in the way described in the second chapter, we have the "male and the female" created. The construction of the rib into a woman establishes the individuality of man before as well as after the removal of the rib. The selection of a rib to form into a woman constitutes her, in an eminent sense, a helpmeet for him, on a footing of equality with him. At the same time, the subsequent building of the part into a woman determines the distinct personality and individuality of the woman. As the great Architect is the fountain of all reason, he never does any thing without reason; it therefore becomes an interesting question, why the creation of woman was deferred to this particular time in human history. But we will not discuss it now.

In the fifth place we are informed that the "seventh day is not said to have had a morning and an evening, nor is God said to have resumed his work on the eighth day." The history of the resting of God on this day does not close with the usual formula, it is true, "and evening was, and morning was, day seventh," and for obvious reasons. In the foregoing days the work of Jehovah was definitely concluded in the period of the one day. On the seventh day, however, the rest of the Creator, so far as this earth was concerned, had just begun, has thence continued to the present time, and will not be completed till the human race has run out its course. Then when the history of man has been completed, when God has consummated his purposes with his sentient creatures in this probationary state, then may we look for a *new creation*, at least for another *fiat* from the Creator to remodel and fit up the heavens and the earth for the abode of man redeemed, a "race no longer in process of development, but completed in number, confirmed in moral character, transformed in physical constitution, and hence adapted to a new scene of existence."

I wish now to inquire into the credibility of the two propositions upon which I have based my thesis: 1. "A long succession of ages, millions of years intervened between the absolute creation of the earth and the time when man was introduced upon its surface." 2. The Mosaic account that, "In six days the Lord *made* the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that in them is." These two propositions seem to cover the entire ground of dispute between geologist and theologians.

Laplace taught that in the primordial condition of the Cosmos there was a nebulous ether, which filled space, and which, by the aggregation of its particles, formed masses which revolved around centers of gravity, creating solar systems—that the forces of attraction, and of arrested motion induced heat to incandescence, which, in the case of the earth, lowered its temperature by radiation into space until the circumference became cool and habitable. But it is not now my purpose to discuss the *modus operandi* of the laws of the physical universe—how it was evolved in space, but to show that it was created by the self-existent Jehovah, and consequently that it had a "beginning," however remote, in the backward stretch of time.

I wish to examine this proposition more in detail, under the light of modern science, and propose to show that all that scientists claim

in regard to the lapse of countless ages since the creation of the material universe may be true according to the teachings of science; and in the discussion of the third proposition will endeavor to show that the teachings of science and the teachings of the Bible are not at variance.

We learn from sacred history that man, and the animals and plants which are contemporary with him, were created by the word of God, "the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is." But man and the animals which now surround him are not the only kinds which have had a being. The surface of our earth anterior to their appearance was the scene of many successive creations of animals and plants. There are scattered through the crust of the earth numerous animal and vegetable remains, which show that the earth had been repeatedly supplied with, and long inhabited by, animals and plants altogether different from those now living. And for the history of these successive races of animals and plants we must look into the record of Nature; for the Bible, the book that tells of man's moral wants, was not intended to teach the history of the antique races. Hence, an attempt to torture the Bible into harmony with the teachings of geology in reference to the geological ages, as developed by the fossil animals and plants contained in the crust of the earth, is at once incongruous with reason, with common sense, and with Revelation. The sedimentary rocks are the only ones which have been found to contain animal and vegetable remains. These are found imbedded in the rocks, just as we should find them in the mud now deposited at the bottom of the ocean, if laid dry. Ask the scientist how sedimentary rocks are made, and he will tell you "by the subsidence of sediment in water." Ask him at what ratio this sediment is deposited, and he will tell you about nine hundred feet in one hundred thousand years; and, as the sedimentary rocks are many miles in thickness, what incalculable years, yes, ages, must have rolled by during the deposition of the sedimentary rocks! Among the stratified rocks, modern science distinguishes ten principal formations, each of which indicates an entirely new era in the earth's history. 1. The Lower Silurian; 2. The Upper Silurian; 3. The Devonian; 4. The Carboniferous formation; 5. The Trias, or Saliferous formation; 6. The Oolite formation; 7. The Cretaceous or Chalk formation; 8. The Lower Tertiary or Eocene; 9. The Upper Ter-

tiary, or Miocene and Pleiocene; and, 10. The Drift, forming the most superficial deposit of the pre-Adamic formations.

Each formation, we are told, contains remains peculiar to itself, "which do not extend into the neighboring deposits, above or below it." "Still," we are told, "there is a connection between the different formations, more strong in proportion to their proximity to each other." Thus the animal remains of the chalk, while they differ from those of all other formations, are, nevertheless, much more nearly related to those of the Oolite formation, which immediately precedes, than to those of the Carboniferous formation, which is much more ancient; and, in the same manner, the fossils of the Carboniferous group approach more nearly to those of the Silurian formation than to those of the Tertiary. These relations did not escape the observations of scientists; and, indeed, they are of great importance for the true understanding of the development of life at the surface of our earth. And, says Agassiz, "as in the history of man several grand periods have been established, under the name of Ages, marked by peculiarities in his social and intellectual condition, and illustrated by contemporaneous monuments, so, in the history of the earth, also, are distinguished several great periods, which may be designated as the various *Ages of Nature*, illustrated, in like manner, by their monuments, the fossil remains, which, by certain general traits stamped upon them, clearly indicate the eras to which they belong."

As was indicated in a previous remark, the Drift immediately preceded the age of man, traces of which we see every-where around us.

We learn from the teachings of modern science that the animals belonging to this period are exclusively marine; for, as the northern part of both continents was covered with water, there was no place where land or fresh water animals could exist. Hence, they appeared at a later period, after the water had again retreated; and, considering the nature of their organization, it is impossible that they should have migrated from other countries, we must conclude that they were created at a more recent period. We learn, then, that the earth had been the theater of successive creations of animals and plants, and that untold ages had intervened between the dawn of life upon its surface and the time of the Drift Period; and as this great cataclysm immediately preceded the creation, or formation of man, we

will now drop the geological record, and introduce the philological argument found in the Mosaic account.

Enough has already been said, I think, to show the credibility of the first proposition; and, as I am not writing a disquisition upon the authenticity of the Bible, I will simply assume the credibility of the second, from the fact that Moses says, that

heavens	the	Jehovah	made	days	six	in	For
הַשָּׁמַיִם	אֵת	יְהוָה	עָשָׂה	יָמִים	שֵׁשֶׁת	בְּ	
hashshamáyim	eth	yehovah	ahsah	yomim	shesheth	ki	
them	in	is	which	all	and	sea	the
בָּם	אֲשֶׁר	כָּל	דָּאֵת	הַיָּם	אֵת	הָאָרֶץ	דָּאֵת
bom	asher	col	veeth	hayam	eth	haärets	veeth

Dr. Harris says "that the first verse of Genesis was designed by the Divine Spirit to announce the absolute organization of the material universe by the Almighty Creator; that, passing by an indefinite interval, the second verse describes the state of our planet immediately prior to the Adamic creation, and that the third verse begins the account of the six days' work."

We have given, I think, abundant evidence from the teaching of modern science that millions of years rolled by during the geological ages. Of this mighty sweep of time, and the operations going on in the material universe, and especially upon the earth, the divine historian, Moses, makes no mention, except what he states in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis. There he makes the grand statement that, "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth."

In this announcement he simply describes the original and primary creation of the whole universe, including our earth; for the Hebrew word בָּרָא (*bahrah*), in this place, evidently means to create, to produce.

We will examine this word more particularly. The best Hebrew lexicographers define בָּרָא (*bahrah*), 1. To cut, to cut out, to carve; 2. To form, to create, to produce; 3. To beget, to bring forth; 4. To feed, to eat, to grow fat. As we are to interpret and determine the meaning of any word by a proper comprehension of the context, the second meaning here given is obviously the only one that is at all consistent with a fair and logical interpretation of it.

Let us see how English lexicographers define the word create.

1. To produce, to bring into being from nothing, to cause to exist;

2. To make or form, by investing with a new character, as to create one a peer or baron; 3. To produce, to cause, to be the occasion of; 4. To beget, to generate, to bring forth; 5. To make or produce by new combinations of matter already created, and by investing these combinations with new forms, constitutions, and qualities; to shape and organize. The evidence of the lexicographers, together with that produced by the context, is quite conclusive, on the whole, in favor of the first hypothesis; that is, of bringing into existence *ex nihilo*; for the word commonly used in the Bible to denote a formation out of pre-existing matter, or creation in a secondary sense, is not בָּרָא (*bahrah*), but עָשָׂה (*ahsah*). In Genesis i, 7, it is said, God made שָׁמַיִם (*yâas*), the firmament. In the 11th verse בָּרָא (*tadsha*), "shall make to sprout." In the 12th verse יֵצֵא (*vattotsâ*), "and made to go out"—produce. The originally passive future is here used for the simple future, which corresponds to our subjunctive; as in old English *shalt*, *shall*, and *should* is used for *wilt*, *will*, and *would*. יֵצֵא (*vattotsâ*) may, therefore, be rendered literally, "it was, that [the earth] would produce"—the earth was made to produce.

In the sixteenth verse it is said, God made two great lights to rule, or as in the original לְמִשְׁחָלֶת (*l'memshâleth*) to the ruling of the day and the night. Certainly no one can glean from this passage the idea that God created the sun *absolutely* on this day. In Gen. ii, 2, 3, the grand climax is reached in the argument; for, as if to put the meaning of these two words, as used by Moses, in this chapter, beyond all doubt, he uses both words in one sentence: "And God blessed the seventh day, because that on it he had rested from all his work, which God had *created to make*, בָּרָא לַעֲשֹׂת (*bahrah' 'lo-him la'asoth*) created God to make. Creation is first in order, afterward to make, to fashion. In this passage בָּרָא (*bahrah*) evidently denotes the original act of creation out of nothing; and עָשָׂה (*ahsah*) the various changes, modifications, and transformations which God, made during the "six days" mentioned in the twentieth chapter of Exodus. This, I think, is evident to every unprejudiced mind. Nor are we left to our own interpretation; for Paul seems to have had the same view of the subject. In his letter to the Hebrews, Chap. xi, 3, he says: "By faith we understand that the worlds were framed by the word of God; so that things which are seen were not made out of things which do appear." God then, in the beginning did not

make the worlds as a smith would make a plow, out of pre-existing materials, but by his almighty fiat he brought them into existence *ex nihilo*. We then conclude that in the first verse of the first chapter of Genesis, Moses describes the absolute creation of the materia universe, and then drops the history altogether until the close of the Drift period, which, as shown by the facts of geological science, immediately antedates the introduction of man, when he resumes it in the second verse, in as far as it concerned the human race. Consequently, we are to look to a vast interval of duration between the periods of the first and second verses for the ages during which our earth has been inhabited by successive tribes of animal and vegetable life. And, as before intimated, we must look to the facts and teachings of modern science for the evidence, for upon this subject the Bible is silent. But just here we are told that the particle ! (*ve*), translated "and" in the beginning of the second verse, connects the history contained in it, in point of time, to that in the first verse.

This is not, by any means, necessarily the case. That the Hebrew particle ! (*ve*), with which Gen. i, 2, begins, is in very frequent use as a copulative conjunction I am fully apprised. But it has several other significations besides, according to the context, and is sometimes used adversatively, signifying "but" or "yet." Examples of this may be found Gen. ii, 17: "But of the tree עֵץ הַיָּדָע (*umaats*) of knowledge of good and evil." Gen. xvii, 21: "But of my covenant בְּרִית (*veth berithi*) will establish with Isaac." "It has been admitted," says an eminent writer, "that an interval between the periods of two immediately succeeding verses is credible, in many passages of Scripture; and as it will in all probability be granted that the possibility of its existence, and not its length, is the point of importance, the conclusion is, that one may have intervened between those of the first and second verses of Genesis." The acceptance of this view is entirely immaterial; as a fair grammatical analysis, and a correct translation of the Hebrew text and context will establish the truth of the proposition beyond cavil. "The Hebrew," says Professor Green, "has distinct forms of the verb corresponding to the two grand divisions of time, the past and the future; but all subordinate modifications or shades of meaning are either suggested by accompanying particles, or left to be inferred from the connection. Whatever is or is conceived of as past, is put in the preterite; the

future is used for all that is or is conceived of as future." "The state of an event," says an eminent Hebrew scholar, "may be described either definitely or indefinitely. It is described definitely by the three states of the Hebrew verb,—the perfect, the current, and the imperfect. The first sentence of this verse, Gen. i, 2, is an example of the perfect state of an event, the second of the indefinite, and the third of the imperfect or continuous." The word הָיָה (*hay'thak*), in the common version is translated by the word *was*, the past tense of the substantive verb *to be*, הָיָה (*hayak*) "he was," חָיָה (*hay'thak'*) "she was." The second sentence describes the condition of the earth at that time by the *paronomasia*, חֹהוּ וָחֹהוּ (*thóhu vabhóhu*), a condition which is understood by the English synonyms "desolate and waste." Hence, a very literal translation of the passage is: "And the earth she had become desolate and waste, and darkness was upon the face of the deep; and the Spirit of God was brooding upon the face of the water."

We therefore arrive at the conclusion that the state of the earth described in the second verse as "desolate and waste" does not mean matter never reduced to form and order, but may signify matter reduced to disorder, after previous organization and arrangement.

The next and last contested ground which I propose noticing before I close is, the meaning of the word יוֹם (*yom*), "day," in Gen. i, and Ex. xx. Examined in the light of modern science, the position taken by the advocates of the long period hypothesis is not only illogical, but inharmonious with the teachings of the first chapter of Genesis and Exodus xx, 11, and incongruous with reason and common sense. According to the teachings of modern science we must necessarily crowd four of the six Mosaic days into one geological age, while each of the other two has an entire age assigned to itself. Geologists do not pretend that there is even a remote approximation to equality between the several divisions of geological time. The geological epochs are distinguished from each other by reason of the very marked difference in the character of their fossil remains. Hence, as far as the present condition of science affords the means of forming an opinion, almost any one of the periods in the Palæozoic Age was as long as all the periods of the Tertiary Age taken together.

But there is another and more serious objection against this

hypothesis, and that is, the geological periods are out of harmony with the days of Genesis, even as regards the history of organic life. According to the Mosaic account, no organic life appeared upon the earth previous to the third day. The third Mosaic day corresponds with the Carboniferous Period of geological time; and yet there is abundant evidence in the fossil remains of the Devonian, the Silurian, and the Cambrian Formations, that organic life—both plants and animals—prevailed upon the earth for many ages before the Carboniferous Period began. It is, indeed, commonly held by geologists, since the discovery of the "*Eozoon Canadense*," the oldest known fossil, that life already existed during the deposition of the Laurentian rocks, the earliest of all the stratified formations. Again, in the Mosaic account, fish are represented as having been created only on the fifth day: whereas, in the geological record we find fish as early as the Silurian Period, which is far back in the Primary Age. These considerations, and many others of a like nature, are fatal to the long period hypothesis. But let us look at the subject for a moment, in the light of philology and common sense.

"That the calling the light 'day,' and the darkness 'night,' with the declaration, that the evening and the morning were the first day, does not necessarily imply that this was the first day, absolutely speaking." For, in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth; and the word heavens is certainly broad enough to include the sun, moon, and stars. And, hence, we are constrained to believe that light existed from the creation of the heavens; for the fossil remains of the animals of the Palæozoic Age indicates that they had visual organs, and hence light must have then existed.

The word חֶשֶׁךְ (*hóshekh*), rendered "darkness" in Gen. i, 2, is in all probability the darkness of clouds referred to by Job xxxviii, 8, 9, and 10. "Or who shut up the sea with doors, when it brake forth, as if it had issued out of the womb?"

"When I made [not created] the clouds the garment thereof, and thick darkness וַעֲרַפֵּל (*va'raphel*) a swaddling band for it. And brake up for it my decreed *place*, and set bars and doors." Here עֲרַפֵּל (*arahphel*) is translated "thick clouds," literally "darkness of clouds," probably from עָרַף (*ahraph*), a "cloud," and אָפֵל (*ahphal*), "to be dark." That this passage refers to Genesis i, is evident, I think, when we look at the facts, for it seems to have been something done

quickly, in a manner analogous to the shutting a door, and not by a slow and gradual process, and hence, appears to agree with Gen. 1, 9, "Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry appear."

In Gen. 1, 5, we have the expression יום אחד (*yom echad*), "day one;" and here we perceive the cardinal number is used, and not the ordinal ואש"ך (*rishon*) "first;" so that the passage literally translated is, "And the evening was, and the morning was, day one." This being the only day for which the cardinal number is used, while all the others have the ordinals "second," "third," "fourth," "fifth," etc., we conclude the existence of a day then was not an "occurrence out of the course of nature, but only that one was singled out and particularized, as a starting-point for the rest."

We will now turn to the twentieth chapter of Exodus, and learn, if we can, the meaning of the word "day" in that passage, "For in six days the Lord made the heavens and the earth, the sea, and all that is in them; and rested on the seventh day; wherefore, the Lord blessed the Sabbath day and hallowed it." How shall we interpret this passage? Shall we appeal to the science of geology? or, shall we not rather apply the rules of Biblical interpretation, and appeal to the context for a solution?

God said to Israel, "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. *Six days* shalt thou labor and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God; in it thou shalt not do any work; thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates." It is obvious that the word day is here used in its ordinary sense, simply to denote a period of twenty-four hours; and that the six days in Gen. 1, were six ordinary days of twenty-four hours each.

No one denies but that the word day is used, both in sacred and profane history, to denote an indefinite length of time; but we can always learn from the character of the subject, or the context of the passage in which it is found, the precise sense in which it is to be understood. How would this passage appear were it interpreted according to the science of geology? Let us see. "Remember the Sabbath—*long period*—to keep it holy. Six *long periods* shalt thou labor, and do all thy work. But the seventh *long period* is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. For in six *long periods* the Lord made

heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested on the seventh *long period*." "Honor thy father and thy mother; that thy *long periods* may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee." Who can conscientiously say that the word "day" in the eleventh verse means a long period, and that wherever else it is used in the context, it simply means a day of twenty-four hours?

I have now passed over the battle-ground, and I leave it for the reader to determine whether I am the vanquished or the vanquisher. Whether vanquished or not, I will continue to sing,

"The diapason sounding free,
Te laudamus Domine."

III.—THE ADVANCE OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE FIRST CENTURIES.

AT the time of Christ's advent, the world was doubtless in a remarkable state of preparedness for his coming. Certainly in a very important sense "the fullness of time" was come. There was uneasiness and restlessness in men's minds; there was great dissatisfaction with the existing or the old forms of religion, and there was an eager looking and longing for something new and more complete and satisfactory. Besides which, the nations were merged more as under one government. Communication between them was easier, and the ideas, as well as the *fact* of civilization and unity were stronger than ever. Yet, after the great Teacher had lived among men and done many marvelous works,—after he had inaugurated a system of heavenly purity and love—after he had died and risen triumphant from the grave, commissioned his disciples to preach his truth in all the world, and then ascended to heaven; and when his followers, endowed according to his promise with the Holy Spirit, had begun their work, *then* there were, of course many difficulties to contend with. Glancing first of all at these, we find that many, if not satisfied, were certainly exalted in their own views. They, according to *their* thinking, were more in the right and held higher position than the mass-

Besides the Epicureans and the Stoics, who each boasted of their philosophy, there were others, who, without calling themselves by any special name, or after any particular school, felt themselves wiser and better than the crowd. *They* could laugh at the simplicity of the vulgar; they said that superstition, which with them was another name for religion, was well enough and even necessary for the common people; but as for *them*, they were above such folly. Now such persons would not like being classed all on a level with the commonest, as *sinner*s before God; they could not come down to that spirit of humility and nothingness required by the Gospel. And besides they would not be satisfied with the source, obscure and unrenowned as it was, of this new religion. Like men in the Savior's own time, they would be ready to say, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" And when they found that the same God was to be theirs as was claimed by or offered to the *lowest*, this would be displeasing, because opposed to all their ideas of the higher dignity of *their* gods, as well as of themselves. Then there were those who had cast off all religious belief. The idea of the uniformity of nature, and nature being the only teacher, and the facts of science the only authority, is far from being new. On such points, *some*, at least, of modern boasters may fancy that *they* are quite original. And yet they are not very much in advance of many who lived long ago. "As early as the third and fourth centuries the arbitrary and heartless dialectic of the Sophists was directed against the might of holy tradition and morals. Plato already represents Socrates discoursing against this rage for enlightenment, which he characterizes as a 'boorish wisdom,' that put itself to the thankless task of tracing back all mythical tales to some natural fact, neglecting, meanwhile, what is most important and nearest to man, the knowledge of himself." And in the times immediately succeeding, appeared a certain Eumeneus from the school of Cyrene, who fancied that he had compassed the long sought object, and resolved the whole doctrine concerning the gods into a history of nature."* If we have *now* such a school for resolving all into some natural fact, we can hardly wonder at such minds opposing Christianity at its start. They would of course look upon its teachings as coming from weakness or fanaticism, and upon its wonders as all to be explained away by the "light of nature," or simply

* Neander, Vol. I, p. 5.

as so many falsehoods. Of the same stamp were many who loved the arts and the study of the beautiful. The exalting of these pursuits as all sufficient is not new either. Many there were in the early ages who were absorbed by them; and what made the matter worse, they were not morally improved by their studies, but rather the opposite. This is the testimony of Polybius. Speaking of the good of religion in promoting the morals of the State, he says the Roman is superior to the Grecian for integrity and trustworthiness, and was to be relied on with far more confidence than any number of securities in the Grecian States. (Neander, Vol. I, p. 6.) It does not speak much for the elevating power of the arts *alone*. Those who most cultivated them were morally the worst. Of course this made them the harder against Christianity. Where men were complacent in their unbelief, self-exalted in their wisdom and immoral, even with their love of the beautiful, how could they accept and love a religion that exposed their ignorance and their iniquity, and called upon them, as those who knew nothing, and were helpless and lost, to obey the commands of a new Teacher? Then further, there were, on the other hand, those who turned back to the old forms of religion and superstition. They longed to have them established and indulged more freely and extensively than ever. They fell in with the notion of every nation having its gods, its forms and ceremonies, and did not understand a religion that proposed, even demanded, the tearing of all these down, and setting up one new and only God, superior to, sufficient for, all. They especially loved the gods and rites of Rome, and to have these destroyed was an idea to them filled with terror, and, of course, made those who presented, advocated it, and labored for its adoption more as raving and ravening revolutionists than as true reformers. Even their restlessness, that agonized after something more perfect, and showed its need, contributed to this feeling; for whilst superstition drove some into unbelief, unbelief in its turn proved insufficient, made others more restless, and drove them back again to superstition, to love it more than before, and to oppose with greater bitterness any thing that came against it. Then, turning in another direction, many there were who loved the pleasures that were emphatically of the world. It was the fashion. It was the mighty stream that took the multitude along. To have religionists that would not go in with the many, but denounced their pleasures, and exposed their

iniquity, to have a comparative few stand square and strong against what had been held from time immemorial as so right and so rejoicing, and to have those few hold up a purer light in which the folly and enormity of what the crowd so relished and loved, this, of itself, raised a multitude of opponents, and a might of opposition, all bearing down bitterly and continually against the Christians.

Again, State policy was another great difficulty in their way. That policy was to have a religion for the State, not for the individual. The man was absorbed in the nation. The emperor supreme, above all, the people were required to reverence him almost as a god, and pay him honors accordingly. Besides, there were many gods, and each nation under the empire was allowed its distinct gods and the privilege of their several religious rites, in subservience, of course, to the laws of the State. But with Christianity there arose disciples that pronounced not only against the gods and religions of others, but against those of Rome also, and claimed allegiance to *theirs* as the one only true God for all classes and nations. And while this Christianity would respect and honor the emperor as ruler, it would *not* sacrifice or do any thing in his honor that seemed like giving him the worship of a god; but the rather demanded *his* obedience, as well as that of the lowest of his subjects, to Jesus Christ. It was not a national religion; it did not pretend even to be that of Jerusalem. The Jews themselves were bitter against it. It could not claim an equality in this respect with other systems the nations had brought into the empire. It was only the religion of a sect. So it was separate from and independent of the State. It appealed to *man* as such. It taught every one to come to a true consciousness of his own individuality, and so to feel his right to freedom and independence. In this respect, as well as in others, it brought an agitating element into society. It was in itself and by all its disciples, and in all its tendencies and movements, a great agitator, even a revolutionist. The magistrate and the emperor were jealous of it, and going, as it did, right opposite to their policy, it had to brave their power. Of course, all these parties and influences tended to create a mighty power of prejudice against Christianity. The Jews hated it. Others were enraged with its disturbing tendencies. If a fire raged, it was the work of the Christians; if an inundation came, it was because of them; if a famine or a plague assailed, it was the Christians who had

aroused the anger of the gods. All these things lit up the fires of persecution, and against falsehood and hate, against imprisonments and torturings, against wild beasts and destroying fires, against the scaffold and the sword, by which thousands of them perished, the Christians had to fight their way and work on.

II. And yet they did succeed! Look at the fact—Christianity did progress and gain strength. We have the record in the book of Acts. There was the great day of Pentecost, when thousands were converted and sent home as missionaries for Christ. When we have such declarations as, "Believers were the more added to the Lord; multitudes both of men and women" (Acts v, 14); "A great number believed and turned to the Lord; much people were added unto the Lord" (xi, 21); "The Word of God grew and multiplied" (xii, 24); "A great multitude, both of Jews and Greeks, believed" (xiv, 1); "Some of the Jews believed, and of the Greeks a great multitude" (xvii, 4); "Mightily grew the Word of God and prevailed" (xix, 20); The proofs are that Christianity largely spread over different parts of Europe and Africa, as well as Asia. The testimony of Tacitus, referring to the time of Nero, thirty years after Christ, is:

"That this pernicious superstition, though checked for a while, broke out again, and spread not only over India, but reached the city also. At first they only were apprehended who confessed themselves of that sect; afterward a vast multitude were discovered by them."*

Then we have the celebrated letter of Pliny, Governor of Bithynia, to the Emperor Trajan, complaining of the trouble arising from the numbers of this sect, and his difficulty as to what to do with them. He says:

"I have recourse to you for advice; for it has appeared to me a matter highly deserving consideration, especially on account of the great number of persons who are in danger of suffering; for many, of all ages and of every rank, of both sexes likewise, are accused. Nor has the contagion of this superstition seized cities only, but the lesser towns also, and the open country." (Paley, 219)

Then, thirty years after Pliny, and one hundred and six after Christ's ascension, we have these remarkable words from Justin Martyr:

"There is not a nation of Greek or barbarian, or of any other name, even of those who wander in tribes and live in tents, amongst whom prayers and thanksgivings are not offered to the Father and Creator of the universe by the name of the crucified Jesus." (Paley, 223)

* Paley's "Evidences." London Edition, 1832. Vol. II, p. 217.

Again: Tertullian, sixty years after Justin Martyr, says:

"We were but of yesterday, and we have filled your cities, islands, towns and boroughs, the camp, the senate and the forum. They (the heathen adversaries) lament that every sex, age and condition, and persons of every rank, also, are converts to that name." (Paley, p. 224.)

Clement Alexandrinus, who preceded Tertullian by a few years, introduces a comparison between the success of Christianity and that of the most celebrated philosophical institutions, and says:

"The philosophers were confined to Greece and to their particular retainers; but the doctrine of the Master of Christianity did not remain in Judea, as philosophy did in Greece, but it spread throughout the whole world, in every nation and village and city, both of Greeks and barbarians, converting both whole houses and separate individuals, having already brought over to the truth not a few of the philosophers themselves. If the Greek philosophy be prohibited it immediately vanishes; whereas, from the first preaching of our doctrine, kings and tyrants, governors and presidents, with their whole train, and with the populace on their side, have endeavored with their whole might to exterminate it, yet doth it flourish more and more." (Paley, Vol. II, p. 226.)

From Origen, thirty years after Tertullian, we have this testimony:

"In every part of the world, throughout all Greece, and in all other nations, there are innumerable and immense multitudes, who having left the laws of their country and those whom they esteemed gods, have given themselves up to the laws of Moses and the religion of Christ; and this not without the bitterest resentment from the idolaters, by whom they were frequently put to torture, and sometimes to death; and it is wonderful to observe, how, in so short a time, the religion has increased, amidst punishment and death, and every kind of torture." (Paley, Vol. II, p. 226.)

We have strong evidence to the same point from another source. "The catacombs of Rome are calculated to extend over nine hundred miles of streets, and to contain almost seven millions of graves." Some have spoken of the number as greatly exaggerated; some have said, also, that the catacombs were used by Christians after the conversion of the Empire. "But still the evidence of vast numbers, which the catacombs furnish, can not wholly mislead; and we may regard it as established beyond all reasonable doubt, that, in spite of the general contempt and hatred, in spite of the constant ill usage to which they were exposed, and the occasional "fiery trials" which proved them, the Christians, as early as the second century, formed one of the chief elements in the population of Rome."*

* Mr. Rawlinson's "Historical Evidences of the Truth of the Scripture Record," p. 218.

Mr. Gibbon speaks of some of these testimonies—especially Terullian's—as exaggerated; and yet they *all* bear strongly in *one* direction; and where there is such unity and force as to the great fact, it is little against *that* to call one or more exaggerated in their expressions about it. Gibbon himself says:

“There is the strongest reason to believe that before the reigns of Diocletian and Constantine, the faith of Christ had been preached in every province, and in all the great cities of the empire.” (“Decline and Fall,” Vol. II, p. 207. Little & Brown's Edition, 1854.)

And just before the reign of Constantine, Arnobius “speaks of the whole world as filled with Christ's doctrine.” And in the time of that emperor we know not only that Christianity was the religion of the empire, but that he presided at the great Council of Nice, to which bishops and presbyters came in their hundreds and thousands to determine upon the faith of the nation and the world.

Fifty years after, Jerome says:

Now the passion and resurrection of Jesus Christ are celebrated in the discourses of all nations. I need not mention Greeks, Jews, and Latins. The Indians, Persians, Goths, and Egyptians philosophize and firmly believe the immortality of the soul and future recompenses, which before the greatest philosophers had denied or doubted of, or perplexed with their disputes. The fierceness of Thracians and Scythians is now softened by the gentle sound of the Gospel, and every-where Christ is all in all.” (Paley, p. 230.)

III. And now, how is it to be accounted for? What were the reasons for this advance of Christianity, and that in the face of so many difficulties? Mr. Gibbon in his celebrated fifteenth chapter assigns five—the zeal of the Jews, the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, miraculous powers of the primitive Christians, and the Christians' active zeal in the government of the Church. These he calls secondary, and if they are not that in themselves, his presentation of them is certainly very unsatisfactory. There is much plausibility in the argument, but there is also a great deal of sophistry. You may suppose that the writer aims to make you feel that he presents the truth; but it is hard to resist the impression that he stabs it besides. “No doubt,” says Sir J. Mackintosh, “no doubt the causes assigned, contributed materially to the diffusion of Christianity; but I doubt whether he saw them all. Perhaps, those which he enumerates are among the most obvious. They might all be safely

adopted by a Christian writer, with some change in the language and manner.”* And others may still doubt “whether he saw them all.” And we may say besides, “language and manner” are very important things, and with Gibbon they seem to be used to throw a cloud over the truth, rather than to show it in all its fair clearness and beauty. The zeal of the Christians, according to his presentation, seems to have been not much better than party bigotry; even the great doctrine of the souls’ immortality was something received in a merely mercenary spirit for the sake of what was to be escaped and then gained; or else with the spirit of terror, that not only feared the fires of the future, but the speedy destruction of Rome by the flames; and it is more than hinted that even that fear arose from the volcanic nature of the country, and that *that* would amply account for the burning if it happened. The good lives of the Christians this author talks of as if he would turn all into a system of pious enthusiasm and fanaticism; the miracles he makes to look as not much better than the jugglery of the common magicians. And the Christians’ part in the government of the Church, as a sort of ignorant and intolerant delusion, leading them to take wrong views of, and to be wholly unfitted for, the pleasures and business of life.

It *does* look, in this fifteenth chapter, as if, after naming some causes for the remarkable diffusion of Christianity, which he is obliged to admit, causes that seem plausible and fair in themselves, he so enlarges in connection with them, not always and fairly upon them, as, after all, to leave the reader with the impression that that progress was nothing more than the success of almost any sect might have been, and was as easily to be accounted for from natural causes. And so it seems that while pretending to admire Christianity as fair and beautiful, he would spoil its loveliness by throwing doubt and dirt all over it, and while admitting its rapid rise and wondrous growth, he would undermine its strength, and take away the very foundation on which it was built.

Nor can the advance of Christianity be accounted for by saying, as it is the more modern style to affirm, that it arose from the peculiar fitness of the times in which it first began to live. The difficulties with which, from the first, Christianity had to contend prove

* Note, “Decline and Fall,” Vol. I, p. 151.

directly the opposite. Mr. Liddon, in his able lecture on the Divinity of Christ, has some forcible words on this very point:

"What was the general temper of pagan intellect but a self-asserting cynical skepticism? Pagan intellect speaks in orators like Cicero, publicly deriding the idea of rewards and punishments hereafter, and denying the intervention of a higher power in the affairs of men; or it speaks in statesmen like Cæsar, proclaiming from his place in the Roman Senate that the soul does not exist after death; or in historians like Tacitus, repudiating with self-confident disdain, the idea of a providential government of the world; or in poets like Horace, making profession of the practical atheism of the school of Epicurus, it is hard to say whether in jest or in earnest; or in men of science like Strabo and Pliny, maintaining that religion is a governmental device for keeping the passions of the lower orders under restraint, and that the soul's immortality is a mere dream or nursery story.

"Modern unbelief complains that St. Paul has characterized the social morality of the pagan world in terms of undue severity. Yet St. Paul does not exceed the specific charges of Tacitus, of Suetonius, of Juvenal, of Seneca; that is to say, of writers who, at least, had no theological interest in misrepresenting or exaggerating the facts which they deplore.

"Indeed, our modern historian of the apostolic age, who sees nothing miraculous in the success of the Gospel, has himself characterized the moral condition of the pagan world in terms yet more severe than those of the apostle whom he condemns. According to Mr. Rénan, Rome under the Cæsars 'became a school of immorality and cruelty; it was a very hell.' 'The reproach that Rome had poisoned the world at large, the apocalyptic comparison of pagan Rome, to a prostitute who had poured forth upon the earth the wine of her immoralities, was in many respects a just comparison.'

"Was it likely that the old Roman society, with its intellectual pride, its social heartlessness, and its unbounded personal self-indulgence, should be enthusiastically in love with a religion which made intellectual submission, social unselfishness, and personal mortification, its very fundamental laws?

"Picture to yourselves the days when the temple of the Capitoline Jupiter was still thronged with worshipers, while often the Eucharist could only be celebrated in the depths of the Catacombs. It was a time when all the administrative power of the empire was steadily concentrated upon the extinction of the name of Christ. What were then to a human eye the future prospects of the kingdom of God? It had no allies like the sword of Mohammedan, or like the congenial mysticism which welcomed the Buddhist, or like the politicians who strove to uphold the falling paganism of Rome." (Lecture III.)

No! Christianity had no such aids, and asked not for them; and yet it conquered. What were, at least, some of the things that contributed to its triumph? In reply, we may certainly say:

1. The working of miracles was one cause. We know, that in the apostolic times, the Lord bore witness to his servants' teachings with signs and wonders. And though it is impossible to define the precise time when such wonders ceased, "It remains undeniable that

even subsequent to the apostles' times, the spread of the Gospel was advanced by such means." (Neander, Vol. I, p. 73.) We have the testimony of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen to the same effect. (Vol. I. pp. 74-75.) Celsus, at the beginning of the second century, thought he could account for the rapid progress of Christianity from the credulity of the age, and classed its disciples with the magicians who were trying to deceive the people. "Yet there was a great difference, as Origen justly replied to Celsus, between their mode of proceeding and that of the preachers of the Gospel. Those magicians flattered men's sinful inclinations; they fell in with their previous modes of thinking, and required the renunciation of nothing. On the other hand, whoever, in the primitive times, would be a Christian, must break loose from many of his hitherto favorite inclinations, and be ready to give up every thing for his faith." (Neander, Vol. I, pp. 71-72.) Besides this, the works of the Christians came from a far different motive; they were not for pay, they were not for means of subsistence, or to secure wealth or notoriety; they were done in pure benevolence, seeking only the good of the aided, and all others who could be influenced. So, doubtless, many were drawn to Christianity by these works. "The wonder and excitement caused by what magicians did, soon ceased, whereas the effects of what the Christians worked were permanent and ever widening. There were efforts in abundance made by the conjurers; but in every case, if they produced any effect, it was only to drive out one devil by means of another." But through the labors of the Christians, the witnessing of heaven on their behalf, men were brought to the knowledge of the true God. "Many have come to Christianity, as it were, against their will, their affections being suddenly changed, by a certain spirit, from the hatred of the Gospel to such love of it, as makes them ready to lay down their lives for it." This is the testimony of Origen. "And he recognizes in the miraculous powers still existing in his time, though already sensibly diminished, a proof of what served, in the first times of the appearance of Christianity, particularly to advance its progress." (Neander, Vol. I, pp. 74-75.) And we may surely add, these miraculous powers so served, not merely because they were wonders, but because they evinced the presence and power of the divine, attesting to what itself was heavenly. For with the mere wonder-workers there was no such high design, there was no such

disinterested love, there was no such pure and godlike teaching; there were no *such* works at all, as with the Christians manifested themselves forth and spoke their power.

2. Another reason for the success of Christianity was its beautiful *adaptation* to man as a spiritual being. It came right home to *him, individually*, as nothing had before. It appealed to *him* as an immortal, and as one having to do *personally* with the great God, the Creator and Governor of the world, and the Judge of all. The God Christianity brought to view was not a God Unknown, like that of the Athenians. He was not a god vile in character, only making his worshipers so. He was not a god of terror, but rendering his service one of slavish fear. Nor was he a god only of the aristocracy, simply for the select few; or one that sat apart from men in the dignity of his position, leaving lower kinds of gods to communicate with them. Nor was the God of the Christians one absorbed in all and every thing, and yet himself without personality. Compared with what had been known, the God the Christians proclaimed was sublimely superior in every respect. He was a God of justice, mercy, and love, near to his creatures, caring for them, ever working on their behalf, and calling them to himself. Christianity showed to man his position before God, and what *should* be his relationship to him. It declared and exposed the sad truth that the world by wisdom knew not God. And yet it came responding to the restless aspirations and agonizing longings of the human breast, and answering the question, "Where-with shall I approach God?" It brought to man's view a way of reconciliation and peace, and opened to him a "throne of *grace*," free of access to all, through the one Mediator. It brought to his view *God in Christ*, wonderful in condescension and mercy, mighty to aid and to save, to whom *he* might ever go, in whom he might ever trust, sheltering under his Almighty wings, as in the care and love of a heavenly Father. Christianity thus brought the true balm for the conscience; it drew the heart and warmed it with the fire of divine love, and it sanctified the whole soul with the enriching power of the Holy Spirit. Christianity thus brought man into new relation with his fellow-man, and came with a principle and a power to bind one to the other, and give new strength and joy to all. It was spiritual, and, appealing to the spiritual, it took hold of man at the very root of all his actions, and worked from the inward to the outward, changing

and reforming the whole life. It was fitted for man every-where, and sought to go to him and lift him up. Its services were not costly and hard and exclusive, but simple and spiritual; and *wherever* the heart opened to it its doors, there it could be at home, and reign in all its saving and elevating might.

3. Another reason to be named for the advance of Christ's religion is the fact that it brought to view and assured to its disciples a blessed immortality. In *its* case this was no doubtful speculation. Life *eternal* by it was brought to light. It was no exalting of heroes only, it was no mere going from one body to another, it was no paradise of sensual delights; nor was it a stoical smothering of all the higher feelings and aspirations of the soul, and a pretending or a trying not to care whether there was any thing in the future or no. The Gospel brought something decidedly, grandly better than all such theories. It did not trifle with the yearnings of the spirit, and it did not cheat the soul, and leave it desolate and dark. It answered the question of the ages, "If a man die, shall he live again?" The immortality proclaimed by the Gospel and believed by Christians was not simply an escape from suffering; it was not something that merely appealed to the spirit of fear, the dread of losing heaven, and incurring the punishment of hell. It was that which spoke to the higher desire of the soul for exalted character, perfect holiness. It offered an eternity of rest and joy supreme, in its being one of purity and love unsullied. It was a *home* of exalted and loving fellowship; it was an abode of *light* and of ever increasing knowledge, of blessed communings and of lasting peace; it was a reward and a crown of rejoicing in the possession of glory like God's own, and at his right hand. It could have been no matter to the Christians whether Rome was burned, or the world soon brought to an end or not. They had got, in the hope of the Gospel, the complement, the completion, of life, the *title clear* to mansions in the skies. It was not a matter of great consequence whether they lived many days or few, whether they were honored of earth or no; they were heirs of heaven, and God reserved the inheritance for them. *Theirs* was not a hope, therefore, that had no concern with, or influence upon, this life. This it had in the best sense; it helped, it animated on to the right life here, and so made more and more meet for the life beyond. Heaven shed a light all radiant with divine beauty upon the path below, and gave

a strength and glory to the life, that led on the more surely to the higher glory.

4. And so we may affirm that another reason for the success of Christianity was the *power in life* it imparted to its disciples. In three ways especially it did give them such power.

It secured elevated character. This was altogether new and strange; yet it was beautiful and blessed. Others were constrained to say, "See how these Christians live!" "See how these Christians love one another!" Their souls were now filled with new influences, their aims were higher, their motives were purer, their purposes and prospects were more exalted, and their joys more heavenly. This was the necessary result of their being Christians. Their relationships were not only new, they were noble, and all their life was lit up and guided by a brighter light and sanctified by holier powers. Such elevated character Christianity aimed to impart, and Christian life is always a *power* in the world. There was especially so, because it was so new, and so wonderful in the eyes of those still in heathenism, and so bright and glorious contrasted with the thick darkness and gross corruption that surrounded them. "How Christianity could adapt itself to all earthly relations, and, while it allowed men still to remain in them, yet by the new spirit which it gave them, the divine life which it breathed into them, how it was enabled to raise men above those relations, is distinctly set before us by a Christian living in the early part of the second century, who thus describes his contemporaries: "The Christians are not separated from other men by earthly abode, by language, or by customs. They dwell nowhere in cities by themselves; they do not use a different language or affect a singular mode of life. They dwell in the cities of the Greeks and of the Barbarians, each as his lot has been cast; and while they conform to the usages of the country in respect to dress, food, and other things pertaining to the outward life, they yet show a peculiarity of conduct wonderful and striking to all. They obey the existing laws, and conquer the laws by their own living." (Neander Vol. I, p. 90.)

So, in another particular, Christianity gave power in life to its disciples; namely, because it strengthened them in its faith as they lived in its light. There was, and is, a self-evidencing power with it. It approved itself to the heart, and was believed and loved, the more

it was known. It courted and could bear all the investigation and trial that might be given, and would come out the brighter for it, and be valued the more, as purest gold. So its disciples came to be confirmed the mightier in their faith, and warmed and more courageous in their zeal. They were zealous, they were enthusiastic; but it was no blind zeal, that would press men into their ranks, from whatever quarter they might come, or of whatever character they might be, with the whip-cords of an ignorant party fanaticism, as Gibbon more than insinuates. It was a zeal according to knowledge, and an enthusiasm enlightened and fired from above; and so it was a zeal which of itself made them the more steadfast and uncompromising in clinging to their faith, as to the true and the divine, and the more earnest in bringing others to it for their eternal life. There is a power thus inherent in Christianity, not only to gain the heart, but to *hold* it, and to strengthen itself every-where in its position, by giving might to its disciples. This is finely illustrated by Paul, who, after a long trial of the matter, could say, "I count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord." So it is also in the well-known words of the noble Polycarp. "Swear, curse Christ, and I release thee," were the words spoken by his persecutor. "Six and eighty years," the old man replied, "*Six and eighty years* have I served him, and he has done me nothing but good, and how could I curse him, my Lord and Savior?" No; there was that dearer in Jesus Christ, to the aged saint's soul, than in all the coffers of wealth, or crowns of empire earth could offer; and all through those six and eighty years of service he had been proving the matter, and all along his Savior had but become the more precious, his own love to him the more intense; so that, rather than deny his Lord, he was cheerfully, infinitely, more ready to die for him.

This also shows how, in another particular, Christianity gave its disciples power,—it enabled them to suffer, to rejoice even in suffering, and to triumph in death. This is well known. It was a wonderful power. Unspeakably superior to all the philosophy of the Stoics, it was impressive and convincing even to persecutors. "No danger could alarm, no opposition could quell, that spirit of active beneficence, it [the spirit of Christian faith and charity] was known to indicate. The fury of the persecutor and the derision of the

scorner was alike powerless before it. He who possessed it stood composed and dauntless against the assaults of calumny, and outrage of earth and hell. As if a shield of adamant were stretched above his head, as if a buckler of triple brass begirt his bosom, he was insensible to weakness and incapable of fear. He might fall, but he would not fly; he might perish, but could not yield. His blood might be spilled upon the ground, but his hope could not waver, nor his love be trampled in the dust; you might crush his limbs with torture, his name with infamy, his freedom with the dungeon and the chain, but he bore within him an imperishable principle, which you could not crush or impair: it was the energy and power of faith." (Dr. M'Call's Sermons.)

It is idle for any one to say, as an objection, in the light of such facts, that others have suffered for their religion. No others ever suffered as *they* did for any religion, but those who have suffered for Christ. The real intelligence and wisdom, the pure lives, the noble spirit, the high designs the strong faith and exalted hopes, the heavenly meekness and patience, the undaunted courage and heroic daring, the disinterested love, the elevated and god-ward aspirations and assurances, and the triumphant soul-joy of the Christians amidst their bitterest sufferings, put them immeasurably above all who have suffered for other so-called religions, and show that they are not to be compared with them for a moment. And what was the effect? Was not *this* power, *in* the Christians, a power with and upon others?

"All your refinements in cruelty can accomplish nothing. On the contrary, they serve as a lure to this sect. Our number increases the more you destroy us. The blood of the Christians is the seed of a new harvest. Your philosophers, who exhort to the endurance of pain and death, make fewer disciples by their words than the Christians by their deeds. That obstinacy for which you reproach us is a preceptor. For who that beholds it is not impelled to inquire into the cause? And who, when he has inquired, does not embrace it; and when he has embraced it, does not himself wish to suffer for it?" (Tertullian, Neander, Vol. I, p. 97.)

So the power in the Christian life, the triumph in the Christian's death, was a possession; it was a glory all their own; and it told mightily for the advancement of their cause, and the honor of their Lord.

5. And so, further, another reason we may name for their success is, the superiority of Christianity to every thing else called or

known by the name of religion. All these things made and manifested its supreme excellence. The world had seen nothing like it before. God had left men to try through the centuries preceding; but they could find nothing satisfactory. "The world by wisdom knew not God;" and, with all its possessions and attainments, it was restless and agonized, and spiritually helpless and lost. Christianity answered to the spirit's needs; it brought the soul to God; it gave it new life for earth, and new light and hope for heaven; it was a voice saying to the spiritual in man, in accents of tenderest love and mercy, "Come and rest;" and it was a power giving calm and peace wherever its appeal was heard. In all this its divinity was shown. This is the great reason, including and surmising every other, why Christianity advanced.

6. It was Divine. All the reasons we have named argue this. Attested by miracles, adapted to man's highest necessities and longings, cheering him with the light and hope of eternal glory, proved in the heart's experience and in the life and power, lighting up the hour of suffering and death with the glories of heaven, giving victory over every foe, proving itself supremely above every other so-called religion,—in all things it speaks its own divinity. It and it alone must be the complete religion—fitted for all men, able to go to all climes, with power inherent in itself to overcome every obstacle, diffuse itself abroad and gain dominion. This is its very nature and power; and it proves it to be of God. He only could know what should be so all-sufficient; he only could give it, and secure its advance. *Divine*—its own Author *purposed* its success; and behind, and with every other influence, *he must* have been working to give it victory.

This Christianity, then, is, it must be, *the one* religion—God-given, man-exalting, *the best*; the only truth—for all men, all climes, and every age. And opposition to it is useless. The words of Origen, spoken for his own days, contain the truth for all times:

"By the good providence of God, the Christian religion has so flourished and increased continually that it is now preached freely without molestation, although there were a thousand obstacles to the spread of the doctrine of Jesus in the world. But as it was the will of God that the Gentiles should have the benefit of it, all the councils of men against the Christians were defeated; and by how much the more emperors and governors of provinces, and the people every-where,

strove to depress them, so much the more have they increased and prevailed exceedingly." (Paley, Vol. II, p. 127.)

And *will*. All councils still or ever arrayed in opposition to Christianity will not defeat it, but will be conquered by it. It is the will and word of God. It was the boast of Voltaire that it took twelve men to establish Christianity—he would show the world that one man could destroy it. But no more than he has done it, will any man or power ever do it. And so this truth in Jesus must prevail still "exceedingly," until it reigns universally. Error must die; and truth must live all triumphant. God is in the work; it can not, therefore, fail. His word has gone forth; and it shall prosper, till all shall know the Lord, and the "wilderness shall blossom as the rose."

IV.—MODERN REVIVALISM.

IT is certainly not very likely that any correct methods of preaching will be devised where there is not a reasonably clear understanding of the true purpose of the Gospel. Hence, in any discussion with regard to methods of working for the salvation of the world, it is all important to first understand distinctly what God has intended preaching to accomplish. And yet, just here there seems to be a sad lack of apprehension in the public mind. In fact, preachers themselves, as a rule, do not seem to know very definitely what their mission is, and especially what the mission of preaching is.

First of all, many preachers seem to think that the principal aim of preaching should be to make men moral, upright, worthy citizens, obedient to the laws of the land. Now, we do not undervalue this important element in religion. It certainly belongs to religion, and especially the religion of Christ, to make men worthy of the highest citizenship, but surely this is not the main purpose in preaching the Gospel of the grace of God.

There is still another important fallacy underlying this subject. It is a sort of habit, especially with American preachers, to boast of our Christian civilization, and to speak in such a manner as to create

the impression that civilization is the great end to be accomplished by preaching. Hence, if we have wise and beneficent laws, good rulers, and prosperous times, we are then most assuredly reaping the rewards of Gospel favor, and the blessings of the reign of the Prince of peace.

This is all certainly very well, and just as certainly belongs to the outgrowth of the Christian religion in the hearts of men. But the primary object of the Gospel is not to create what is popularly called civilization; it has a purpose far more noble than this.

Recently we have had a class of preachers growing up among us who go even further than those we have noticed. They emphasize, with commendable earnestness, the individual responsibility of men. They teach that the *individual* must be educated in order that the *nation* may be what it ought to be. So far this teaching is evidently correct. But when we come to look into what is required for the individual, we find that his relation to the religion of Christ is regarded as of consequence only so far as this relation will help him into a higher intellectual culture, and that the true object of preaching is to produce this culture, and preaching that fails to do this is simply worth nothing at all.

Now, it is believed that these views, variously modified, but in the main as we have stated them, are seriously held by a large class of religious people and not a few prominent ministers of the Gospel. Hence, it becomes us to ask the question, Do these views, any or all of them, express the primary object of preaching? We think not. We think that the principal object of preaching is, not to make men moral, not to make a beautiful civilization, nor again a high, intellectual culture, but to *save men*—to redeem them from sin, and bring them into fellowship with God and with one another. Hence, we would emphasize the fact that the primary purpose of the Gospel is to overcome sin in its dominion over the human soul, and that it is with sin as an opposing power that the Gospel comes in conflict in its struggle to regenerate the world.

That other beneficent results will flow out of this influence of the Gospel on the souls of men is unquestionably true. But these results must always be considered as secondary, and must not, therefore, be allowed to assume the importance of that which is the principal object in the propagation of the Gospel. And yet it is feared that

the secondary results of preaching have been elevated into the first place; hence, the efforts of the present day seem to be largely to civilize men rather than save them, to moralize them rather than to make them Christians, to educate them intellectually rather than to cleanse them from all unrighteousness. This mistake we conceive to be at the foundation of much of the failure which is every-where apparent in our efforts to convert the world. If we are aiming to meet all these conditions by preaching, then we are evidently attempting too much; and, having overloaded ourselves, we will not be likely to accomplish any thing worthy of the great trust committed to our hands.

We call attention to this matter just now because of its importance in revival work. We have just fairly got started in the revival season, and, as extraordinary efforts are being put forth in many places to convert the people, it is well that we should understand what is fundamental in a successful work of evangelizing the world. We must, therefore, keep the Gospel to its single purpose, and must not allow our preaching to be diverted from this aim—that of saving the world from sin.

Another important matter must not be overlooked. We must not fail to preach the Gospel. It is easy to say that this is precisely what we do; but a little reflection will help us to see that what we claim is not always in accordance with the facts in the case. Preaching *about* the Gospel is not preaching the Gospel; preaching theories and speculations is not preaching the Gospel; preaching a part of the Gospel is not preaching the Gospel; and preaching a Gospel that is not the Gospel, or preaching a perverted Gospel, is not the Gospel. What is needed at this point is the preaching of the Gospel as it was given by Christ and preached by his apostles. Nothing else will answer the purpose. Nothing can be successfully substituted for this, and all efforts to convert the world by any other instrumentality will prove a most signal failure. We must have no hesitation here. There must be no compromise in reference to that which is declared to be "the power of God unto salvation." It must be proclaimed faithfully, earnestly, and in full confidence that it will triumph. Let preachers every-where announce the message which God has sent for the salvation of the world. It is not their privilege nor their duty to modify this in any particular. If the people do not

like it, let preachers understand that this is precisely what may be expected, and is, in fact, just what Christ predicted. Many rejected the Gospel in the days of the apostles, and many will doubtless continue to reject it. But this is no reason why the Gospel should be toned down to the tastes and habits of an ungodly world, in order that it may be popular. The very moment this is done, the Gospel is shorn of its strength; it is no longer God's message; it is no longer "the power of God unto salvation." And it is no wonder that this Gospel thus perverted, thus diluted, not only does not convert the world, but does not even command the respect of the Church itself.

We wish now briefly to consider some of the methods adopted by modern revivalists, and ascertain, as far as possible, whether these methods are likely to be productive of such a religious awakening as will, in the long run, be healthful and productive of permanent results. The recent remarkable career of Messrs. Moody and Sankey in Great Britain and Ireland, and their still more recent efforts in Brooklyn and Philadelphia, have called attention to the subject of revivals in a very emphatic way. And it becomes us to look with entire candor upon what they have accomplished, and the means by which it was accomplished, and to appropriate such lessons as may be useful to us in the conversion of the world. Hence, for the present, we will pass by all other revivalists of the present day, and carefully consider the methods of these two men, who have evidently won the front rank among those who work according to their plan.

1. We think it will scarcely be denied that much of their success depends upon good business management. They have evidently a careful eye to business arrangements. They do not commence their work until they are ready. It may be that they have a proper regard for the old-fashioned notion that the great thing in a revival is to get the Lord ready; but whether they have or not, it is unquestionably true that they give their earnest attention to the human side of things. Nor is this feature in their method to be despised. Necessarily, the Lord has left many things to human wisdom in arranging for the conversion of the world, and whoever ignores this fact is not likely to succeed to any astonishing degree. It may be well not to forget the old notion; but we do not think it possible to emphasize too much the importance of giving proper attention to human in-

strumentalities. It may be that Messrs. Moody and Sankey are too particular in this respect. It may be that their nice calculations are not in harmony with an exalted faith; but, after all, we are forced to the conviction that God himself works through instrumentalities, and generally gives success to those who are careful to arrange for it. At any rate, we are satisfied that much of the success of these evangelists, as they are called, depends upon the business-like manner in which they go about their work; and this, we think, is the first lesson of importance which we should learn from what they have accomplished. It seems to us that they have practically settled the question, that very ordinary talent in the ministry may make itself very decidedly felt, if it have the hearty co-operation of a good business management.

2. So far as the preaching is concerned, the success of Mr. Moody depends largely upon his appreciation of the real purpose of the Gospel, such as we have stated its purpose to be in the beginning of this article. He evidently gives very little attention to the mere education of men. His whole purpose in preaching is to *save* men, to make them realize the need of a Savior, and to point them to that Savior as the source of all life and blessedness. He does not deal in "glittering generalities" about a "Christian civilization," nor does he for a moment trust a legal self-righteousness; but he thunders the anathemas of the law against all ungodliness, and then shows the only way of escape, which is by the blood of Jesus. This gives his preaching a constant, present application, and makes every man feel that he is not only personally addressed, but that he is also personally responsible to lay hold of the offers of mercy which are so graciously proposed in the Gospel. It is not wonderful at all that this direct preaching, in precisely the line of the purpose of the Gospel, should produce the very results which are found to follow it. The people have for a long time been entertained by tropes and figures: they have been stuffed with science, and made to trust in glittering generalities concerning the "perfection of human nature," "the mighty progress of the race," and "the grandeur of our civilization," until many had come to conclude that sin is a myth, and unrighteousness only a slight irregularity, which will be all right by and by, when, in the struggle of life, the doctrine of the "survival of the fittest" has been fully canonized in the popular faith. Mr. Moody's

preaching smashes right through these vain conceits of half-informed skeptics and latitudinarian ministers, and, what is worse, self-conscious hypocrites, who have stolen the livery of heaven in which to serve the devil.

3. Another important element of success in Mr. Moody's preaching is the prominence he gives to Scripture readings. We do not know how much real value there is in these readings, if we take into account the amount of information conveyed. We suspect, as a general rule, the teaching is somewhat imperfect, and never very profound or satisfactory. But it is not in this that we find Mr. Moody's element of strength; it is in his earnest belief in the Word of God as our guide in religious matters. We think it quite likely his theology, if he has any, is not always in harmony with the exaltation which he gives to the Bible; still, the people forget his own crudities in the presence of his overtowering faith in God's eternal truth. It is not so much what is learned in these readings, that is important, as that the meetings are held, and the Word of God magnified as a lamp to our feet and a light to our path. In the vain speculations of a half-earnest pulpit, the importance of God's Word has been largely lost sight of, and with this degeneracy has come the corresponding weakness in spiritual life and activity which must always necessarily follow. Mr. Moody's effort is to cut loose from the shallow nonsense with which the souls of men have been fed, and urge upon the people the importance of receiving the unadulterated "milk of the Word," that they may grow thereby. With him there is no higher appeal than the plain teachings of the Bible, and whether he is always consistent with this faith or not, he makes the impression, upon the people at any rate, that the Word of God is the only source of authority in religious matters. This, at once, gives dignity, warmth, and power to all his utterances, and makes his preaching, which would be commonplace indeed without this, almost irresistible before the vast audiences he addresses. In fact, so prominent a feature is this in his ministry that his style is even dogmatical to excess, and would certainly be beyond endurance, were it not for the abundant evidence he gives of the sincerity and the unselfishness with which he labors. But these considerations even would not redeem his style from the severest criticism, did he not constantly assume to speak only the oracles of God. It is the reference which he makes in his final appeal that not only overcomes our

prejudice against his apparent dogmatism, but compels us to concede this as one of the strongest elements of his preaching.

It seems to us that here is a lesson which preachers generally ought to take seriously to heart. We think the modern pulpit would be greatly benefited by substituting the Word of God for the thin sentimentalisms and stupid platitudes about the beauties of science and the glories of human nature, which furnish the staple of so much preaching in these days. The people have been fed upon this insipid stuff, until almost any other thing is relished by them; but when they are called to the earnest pleadings of God's Word, to its solemn sanctions of right and fearful denunciations of wrong, it is not strange that a great awakening follows, and many cry out, "What must we do to be saved?" And in view of these facts ought we not more and more to believe in the Scripture which says, "He that hath my Word, let him speak my Word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat, saith the Lord."

4. Another important element of Mr. Moody's success is in the fact that he fixes for the sinner with definite certainty the *time when* he is accepted of God. This has been a grave fault with many of the old methods among revivalists. The old style was to bring the sinner to the mourners' bench, and there labor with him from time to time until, to use the phraseology adopted by the workers in such meetings, he himself was satisfied that he had "got through." This left the sinner in constant doubt as to his actual situation. He realized that he was a sinner; he knew he wanted to be saved; he was quite well satisfied that Jesus was his Savior, but, somehow or other, he could not fix the time when he was accepted. He was told to consult his feelings, but he found these variable and wholly unreliable in a matter of so much importance. Hence, he was left as a sort of pendulum, swinging between his hopes and his fears, now on one side, and now on the other, until often, becoming weary of the struggle, he turned away from the whole thing in disgust, and became a confirmed infidel.

The writer of this had a conversation with one of the leading editors of this country only a few months ago. He is a man of unquestionable ability, occupies a leading editorial position on one of the most widely circulated secular papers in the United States, but he is a scoffing infidel, and the marks of his infidelity are constantly

seen in the editorials of his newspaper. We called his attention to this fact, and asked him why it was that he seemed even to delight in finding fault with the Christian religion. He then told us his history. He said he was the son of a distinguished clergyman, and that in his earlier life he had intense religious convictions. He said he had been to the mourners' bench between fifty and a hundred times. He had been told what to expect, but had been constantly disappointed. He had prayed earnestly and had been prayed for; he had labored and struggled through weary nights and weary days, to obtain rest for his weary soul, but had in every instance failed; and had finally decided that the whole matter of conversion was a delusion, and that Christianity was a cheat, and he felt it his duty, as an honest man, to expose it before the world.

Now, we can not help deploring the conclusion to which this man arrived, but we can not help also deploring the perversion of the Scriptural plan of conversion, by which his infidelity was created; and yet this is the method that has had the chief place in modern revivalism until the advent of Messrs. Moody and Sankey.

Their method is very different from this. Mr. Moody preaches that the sinner may have rest *immediately*; that there need be no agonizing about the matter; that the sinner's salvation is already secured, and all that is necessary on his part is to reach forth his hand and appropriate it. He need give little attention to feeling; his own subjective state has little or nothing to do with the question of his acceptance, if only his faith in Christ is firmly fixed; for the very moment he trusts implicitly in Jesus, that moment is he assured that his sins are pardoned, and his name written in the Lamb's book of life.

Now, we are not quite prepared to accept the truth of all this, and yet it is very far in advance of the old method, and it is certainly vastly more powerful to the sinner himself. What a poor trembling sinner needs when he is convicted of sin, when he realizes that he is lost, is an *assurance* of salvation, a *present* salvation; and the doctrine that he may have this assurance, and have it *now*, came to the world like a new revelation; and it is not astonishing at all that thousands of those who "labor and are heavy laden" should lean upon Mr. Moody's words for comfort and rest.

We have already intimated that we can not accept all Mr. Moody says on this subject, as the teaching of Scripture. Or perhaps we

ought to say, he does not say enough. All he does say is nearly right, so far as it goes, but the trouble is it does not go far enough to embrace all the conditions of pardon. Still, it does give the sinner something, at least, that is definite, upon which he may lay hold ; and that is just what he needs. Hence, this method of Mr. Moody becomes at once a strong element of success.

5. It has been generally thought that the singing of Mr. Sankey has as much to do with the success of the Moody-Sankey meetings as any thing else. Doubtless, this was largely the case in Europe, but it is far from being the most important element of their success in this country. The novelty of the thing in Europe was an immense attraction. In fact, the novelty of every thing connected with the meetings had a very decided influence in drawing the people. In a country where Church services had become a dreary monotony, and where singing especially had long been a mere musical performance, just as it is in the concert-room, and often without any profounder sanctification, it is easy to see how Mr. Sankey's unaffected simplicity of song and earnestness of manner would arouse popular enthusiasm, and inspire a new interest in this department of Christian worship.

But in this country the case is quite different. The people here have already been surfeited with that kind of singing which Mr. Sankey represents ; and although it may yet be pleasing to almost every body, and may even be inspiring to some, it is quite certain that, in the estimation of the more thoughtful, it has been "weighed in the balance and found wanting."

The following, from the *New York World*, on "Our Singing Pilgrims," is not only in the main true, but is a most excellent statement of the case :

"When that evangelical troubadour, Mr. Philip Phillips, gave up singing with George Christy, and went, with his lays newly adjusted to sentiments of seductive piety, into the Church, announcing upon all his cards and posters, with a flippancy worthy of a minstrel, that henceforth he was 'singing for Jesus,' he inadvertently opened the door to a rich and unworked domain. We are not surprised to hear that his example has been imitated by several other trollers, who, with clean faces, and, we trust, with clean hearts, have set out to make Zion glad with their ditties.

"That system of itinerant work among the people which now passes by the name of evangelization is marked by an entirely fresh outburst of song. The Methodist madrigals that gave such a cheery ring to camp-meetings, and drew crowds to the meeting-houses during revivals, have been copied by more tuneful,

if not more zealous, workers; and the chief singer of the tabernacle and the rink is he who can execute a sentimental solo and provide a refrain for the congregation.

"The demand for ditties, and mellifluous warblers thereof, has brought into the service the elegant soloist who oftentimes chanted "Rosa Lee," and kindred devices, in cork. Far be it from us to intimate in the most shadowy way that these evangelized minstrels have not seen clearly the error of their way, or that they are not furnishing a more wholesome entertainment behind the altar-rails than they can possibly furnish behind the foot-lights. It does not become us to turn from a fellow-creature's melodies to his motives. It is with the songs themselves that we have mainly to do, seeing that they have multiplied prodigiously of late, and that the conventicle threatens to furnish the Summer garden with its popular choruses. To those Christians who possess a robust sense of duty, and clear understanding that religion is not made up of romances, it must have occurred that these singing pilgrims are loading piety of the common emotional order with a great deal of fanciful and sweetish nonsense.

"It may also have dawned upon the minds of many in the great congregation, that the pilgrims, in changing the phraseology of their ditties, have not changed their sentimental character; that, in a word, they are still giving entertainments and tickling the populace through its ears, the only appreciable difference being that now they do it in the name of the Lord.

"It is quite a serious view of evangelization that presents itself to men and women of chastened and cultivated taste—seeing that the conversion of the world is to be accompanied by a deluge of ditties. One asks himself, with some alarm, why it is that awakened sinners should evince an instant and ungovernable desire to 'hold the fort,' in the loudest and most threatening manner; and for what reason the penitent, from whose eyes the scales have fallen, and who, it is only reasonable to believe, is the better enabled to perceive the many unpleasant duties that lie in his path, should promptly and persistently invoke an angel band to bear him away on their snowy wings to an eternal land. To summarize what may be called the pilgrim school of sacred song, one has to disregard its sincerity altogether, and deal with its sentimentality. It assumes that the highest earthly delight of human beings, whose vocal organs have not been destroyed by sin, is to anticipate in song those luxuries of idleness and emotion that belong to the pagan Elysium. It is at the best a fiberless order of exercise, in which the fancy, and not the convictions, take part; in which the singers are always bathing luxuriantly in

"The river of life,
That flows thro' our Father's land,
Gleaming ever so bright in the heavenly light,
And rippling o'er golden sand."

"Utterly unlike those sturdy old chorals which our fathers sang out of reverent hearts, and whose majestic cadences are still heard volleying in humble places, these tripping measures of the troubadours merely tickle the sensibilities, and we fear that hundreds of weak-minded people congregate for no other purpose than to applaud with their hearts, as they often did before with their hands, the sweet soloist who thus deftly sets the mysteries and the solemnities of religion to a chirrup.

"It is only with the knowledge that the new use of music is part of the evangelizing process, that we pause over it. The *World* has always stoutly contended for popular songs. Of common music we can not have too much in its place. That

its place is in the house of prayer, or that its mission is to sirup the penny song-book for believers, we can not believe.

"One shudders at the conversion of the world, if we are all to walk about with Philip Phillips's harp in our hands, crooning his idyllic strains. Far better, indeed, would it be for the evangelists to follow the advice of the Psalmist, and take a psalm and bring hither the timbrel and the psaltery, and blow up the trumpet in the new moon in the time appointed."

While we may not fully share the apprehensions of this writer, it is quite clear to our mind that the time has come when Christian people ought to stop and think upon what is likely to come out of all this. Already we find many of the Churches giving up their evening meetings to what is called a "Service of Song," and the regenerate and unregenerate are alike expected to participate in contributing to the entertainment. We say "entertainment," because that is just what is aimed at. Doubtless, the thought of saving souls is remotely connected with these meetings. But the first and all important thing is to have people *interested*, and, in order to do this, the preaching of the Gospel is placed in the background, while the singing of some very classical music by a paid choir, who are often only a little while out of the opera, or from the Bacchanalian revel of Saturday night, is relied upon as the principal attraction. True, sometimes there is an attempt at congregational singing, but it is generally of that thin, sentimental kind which seems to be the chief staple of our modern "Singing Pilgrims." The music of these songs is certainly bad enough. In fact, it is often simply intolerable to the cultivated ear, but the words are even worse. To analyze the words is only to lower one's estimation of the possibility of the people's appreciation of any thing like true poetry, while the sentiment is often as ridiculous as the words that express it. Most of the songs, indeed, are principally concerned with rides "down the river," or "over the river," or "down the shining river," or "over the rapid river;" in fact, without the idea of a "river," in some way, this modern psalmody would seem impossible. This is only one specimen of a thousand; but this will suffice for the present.

Now, what we believe is, that this kind of singing is not producing any very permanent results in these revival meetings. It may be that the people are attracted to the meeting by this; but, if so, the impressions they receive after they get there are certainly not such as are likely to be productive of an earnest piety and faith that

will be approbated by thoughtful Christian workers. Hence, while we are willing to concede that some good is accomplished, and considerable people attracted, by Mr. Sankey's singing, still we are decidedly of the opinion that whatever success may follow the meetings in the way of conversions ought not to be attributed to this cause. The real work in conversion is accomplished by Mr. Moody's earnest, direct preaching, and not by Mr. Sankey's beautiful singing. Let this be understood at once and for all, before the habit of introducing sentimental ditties to accompany the proclamation of the Gospel shall become fixed in our American Churches.

6. After all that may be said, it is perhaps true that the success of these revival meetings mainly depends upon the active co-operation of the various evangelical Churches. The meetings furnish a sort of common ground, where all who love and serve the Lord Jesus may meet and work together. Hence, the Moody and Sankey movement is, at least partially, a union movement. But whether it shall ever accomplish much in the direction of permanent union among the people of God or not, it shows with sufficient clearness what might be accomplished if such a union could be permanently effected. Who believes that these two men could have any very decided measure of success, were it not for the support which they receive from the various religious denominations? Who believes that they would succeed even tolerably well under the auspices of any one religious denomination, no matter how strong or how popular? It is the claim of unsectarian character which this movement makes that gives it vitality and strength before the people, and brings to it a large measure of the success with which it has been crowned.

If this union element is, after all, the real power in the movement, it is certainly worth while for us to reflect a moment as to what might be accomplished could we have such a co-operation of Christian people every-where, under the leadership of other men, for the conversion of the world. We venture to say that there are a thousand preachers in the United States who would command more attention, and would do more effective work in the evangelistic field, than these men are doing, if they could have the same co-operation of religious people, the same sympathy for their work which is accorded to Messrs. Moody and Sankey. It is an old saying, that "nothing succeeds like success," and this is as true of preaching the

Gospel as of any thing else. Success in preaching brings success. Where a great many people go, a great many more are sure to go; and when once the crowd is gathered, the enthusiasm will often supply the place of the most inspiring eloquence before an audience half as large. No man understands this matter better than Mr. Moody. He is not eloquent, he has very little personal magnetism, but he is earnest and direct in his style of address, even to bluntness often, and deals faithfully with the needs of the people. But all this would be unavailing, in a very great degree, were it not for the crowds that gather to hear him; and these crowds are brought together by the co-operation of the various denominations, and the good business management with which Mr. Moody inaugurates and carries forward his work. Hence, if we were called upon to designate what we believe to be the most powerful element in his success, we should unhesitatingly answer, co-operation—earnest, active co-operation of the various religious denominations. And we go further. We believe that very largely the same results would follow the preaching of almost any earnest man whom we might select at random, did the Churches rally to his support as they have to Mr. Moody's. And if this be true, it is plain that we can have these religious meetings in every city, all over the land, without waiting for Messrs. Moody and Sankey to come round. And as we are now fully in the midst of the revival season, would it not be well to try the experiment, by uniting the home ministry of every city and the Churches of every city in a union work for the conversion of sinners? We are willing to risk our reputation as a careful student of passing events by prophesying in advance, that if such a movement were heartily entered into, and worked out with a conscientious regard for the great end in view, namely, the conversion of souls, it would be abundantly successful.

Of course, we would wish to have some modifications in the plan as it is represented by Messrs. Moody and Sankey. Some of these modifications we wish now to call attention to:

1. We would change the style of singing. We would not do this in every respect, but in some important particulars. We believe it is best to have a leader such as Mr. Sankey is; one who has a controlling voice, and who can easily lead a large congregation. This gives confidence, and enables the singing to proceed with something like

order. But by far the best thing it does is to secure promptness in the starting of hymns, in relieving the monotony of the meeting at just the right time with an inspiring song. Such a man by the side of a preacher in such meetings is almost indispensable. Nor would we object to a solo now and then, if this is found to produce a good effect. But we would substitute a different class of hymns and tunes for those now used by Mr. Sankey. Music that is commonly called revival music, and hymns that are commonly called revival hymns, may be said generally to operate upon the spiritual man as false stimulants do upon the physical man; they may produce a temporary elevation of the circulation, but the final result will be far from beneficial. The people have already too much nonsense in their religion, and certainly too much sentimental goodness. They need more strength and real permanent life-force in their religious convictions, in order that they may have worthy religious character, and be visibly effective upon the world for good. It is unquestionably true that singing has considerable influence in shaping religious character. Hence, the class of songs sung should be such as to inspire the noblest consecration and the highest devotion in the Christian life. Let us have the grand old chorals of our fathers set to such earnest words as will carry the soul into sweet and joyful communion with Christ and God and saints. Let these hymns tell of the soul's struggle, and its triumph through Christ, and its hopes of the crown. In other words, let the hymns of the Church be constantly a profound reflection of the Church's spiritual life in the depths of its feeling, and in its earnest faith in laying hold of Christ as the only Savior of sinners. We think that this will show an immense advantage over the present "hey-diddle-diddle-the-cat-and-the-fiddle" style, which is so common in many revival meetings.

2. We would have the preaching just as *earnest* as Mr. Moody's is, just as pointed, and just as faithfully exposing "the exceeding sinfulness of sin."

But it takes three things to preach the Gospel fully:

First. We must preach that men are sinners. This must be faithfully done; for out of this fact grows the whole remedial system. Without this, Calvary is a farce, and the preaching of the Gospel is an insult to the intelligence of mankind.

Second. We must preach that Jesus is the Savior of sinners.

There must be no hesitation on this point either, no trembling uncertainty; it must be declared distinctly and emphatically. Jesus must be lifted up as the hope of a perishing world, not only as their Savior, but as their only Savior, as their only hope.

Third. We must, then, faithfully tell *how* this Savior saves these sinners. Here is just where Mr. Moody fails. His power to convict men of sin is very great. That he faithfully points them to the Lamb of God, "who taketh away the sins of the world," will not for a moment be doubted; but those who are acquainted with his style of preaching know that when he comes to the third point, he seems either not to know what to tell the sinner, or is simply unfaithful in his dealings with him. No matter how this is, of one thing we are profoundly convinced; namely, he does not respond to the question, "What must I do to be saved?" so as to furnish the sinner with an infallible answer to his earnest question. He tells the sinner to believe in Jesus; but often the sinner already does that. He tells him to repent; but often the sinner has done that also. Does he tell him to be baptized? Does he preach the whole commission as given by Christ to his apostles? We think not. Why does he stop short? Why is it he fails to declare one of the conditions upon which the salvation of the sinner is suspended? This we regard as his chief fault; and if he is conscious that it is a fault, he is certainly culpable in the sight of God and in the sight of all good men, for thus dealing unfaithfully with the Gospel. Charity suggests that he does not understand the importance of this. But, surely, it is difficult to believe how such a practical mind as his is can fail to see the importance of declaring the whole counsel of God.

We know there are some difficulties in dealing with the subject of baptism which might seriously embarrass Mr. Moody's movements. If he was to insist that all who believe in the Lord Jesus Christ should be immediately baptized, he would at once run against the prejudices of many of those who are co-operating with him. And besides this, he would find himself in great trouble frequently in reference to the various modes of baptism. And it may be for this reason, as well as others that may be stated, that he has agreed to pass over the whole subject, and treat it as though it were quite an indifferent thing. But has any man of God a right to do this? Paul said he commended himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God by

"manifestation of the truth," not by handling the Word of God deceitfully ; and so we hold it to be the duty of every earnest pleader for the salvation of men. There must be no compromise in that which God has plainly commanded. There must be not only earnestness in convincing the world of sin, and of pointing them to the Savior of sinners ; but there must be faithfulness also in telling sinners *how the Savior will save them.*

3. We come now to consider what is by far the most objectionable feature in the Moody-Sankey meetings. We refer to the use which is made of prayer. Now, we do not wish to be misunderstood at this point. We have the very greatest confidence in the power and efficacy of prayer. No one can emphasize too decidedly the importance of prayer as a means of Christian growth, and as a help in all our work for God. Nevertheless, we can not give our assent to such a perversion of prayer as is all too evident in the Moody-Sankey meetings, and, in fact, in all the meetings of modern revivalists. But we have less respect for this perversion of prayer as we find it under the administration of Mr. Moody, because much of Mr. Moody's preaching is in direct antagonism with his theory of conversion. He preaches a present salvation. He preaches that the sinner is responsible to God for the manner in which he treats the Word spoken. He preaches that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, and relies upon the cross as that by which the world is to be crucified to the sinner, and the sinner to the world. And yet he turns away from this plain Scriptural teaching to the very foolish fancy that the sinner can do nothing, after all, until God shall, in some mysterious way, by special interposition, lead him to a knowledge of Christ. Hence, prayer is substituted for obedience ; the Throne of grace is called into requisition to take the place of baptism. Thus the Gospel plan is perverted, and the sinner is at last left to the unscriptural doctrine that God will save him in answer to prayer, for all the comfort that he enjoys.

But this doctrine has an almost ludicrous side. It leads, to excesses which become ridiculous, even in the eyes of those who practice them. Think of having two or three hundred requests for prayers, and reading them to a large audience from slips of paper, and then some one to bear these requests before the Throne of grace. Think of this as a serious matter in the light of Scriptural

teaching, and who does not see at once that it is an entire perversion of one of the most important privileges vouchsafed to the Christian? We do not say that we may not carry the requests of our friends upon our prayers to God; but what we do say is, that we can not do this in a public manner, and in the business-like style with which it is done in revival meetings, without destroying all seriousness in reference to the whole matter.

Furthermore, this method is misleading, and is therefore constantly making infidels. It might be sufficient to say it is well-known that many of these requests are not answered, and therefore the effect in the mind is that the promises of God have failed. But the real truth is, there are no such promises as are here relied upon. Passages of Scripture relating to the efficacy of prayer are quoted to support this method; but these are as clearly misapplied as that the method grows out of a false view of the Divine government. But we will not insist upon this point. It misleads in calling the sinner's attention to the wrong thing. He should be pointed to Christ; he should be exhorted to trust in him. And when he exercises this trust, he should immediately obey him; put him on in baptism, and rise to walk a new life. But, instead of this, he is told to trust in Christ, that this is all-sufficient; and in order that he may trust in him with a saving faith, prayers are offered on his behalf. Then, in answer to these prayers, the sinner is made to realize that he is accepted of God. Now, all this is not only unscriptural, but is positively a perversion of the Gospel plan of salvation. And it is because this is so that we enter our solemn protest against the whole proceeding.

But we may be asked, Shall we not pray for sinners, and may they not even pray for themselves? We answer, unhesitatingly, Yes. Both of these may be done, and yet save the Gospel from the shame to which it is exposed by modern revivalism. The Church should pray for the world, but certainly not when they are refusing to do what the Gospel plainly commands them to do. God is a god of order, and not of confusion. He has appointed specific means for specific ends. To illustrate: In the natural world he has appointed light as a medium of sight, and nothing else can take its place. He has appointed water to quench thirst, air for the lungs, and food for the body; and these can not be dispensed with, or other things

substituted, without serious consequences. Shall we say that he is less orderly in his moral government? Must we accord to him the highest intelligence in physical things, in arranging the symmetry, adaptation, and harmony of all things in nature; but when we come to the kingdom of grace, believe that he has left every thing in confusion? Can we in truth think that our Heavenly Father could possibly act in this way? As a fact, we know that he does not act in this way. He has ordained the Gospel as his power to the salvation of men; this must be preached faithfully as his means to turn men from darkness to light, and nothing else can be substituted for it. Furthermore, this Gospel has specific conditions, which must be accepted; and nothing else can be substituted for these without perverting the whole Gospel plan. Prayer, specifically, belongs to the Christian, is an institution of the Church, and is a means to help the Christian in his struggle to overcome. But modern revivalism has put prayer out into the world, and baptism into the Church, which is an entire perversion of Heaven's order. Baptism is not an ordinance of the Church, but of the Gospel; and the Gospel is that which stands between the world and the Church, and through which the world is brought into the Church.

Hence, we conclude, that while there are many good things in modern revivalism, it is, upon the whole, in the way of the progress of the Gospel of Christ. True, it stands as a solemn protest against the formality, the coldness, and the worldly-mindedness of modern Protestantism; it is an effort of earnest men to break over the dead point in the progress of the religion of Christ. But it carries with it a fatal poison; it inoculates Christian activity with a most serious error, practically sets aside the Gospel and its ordinances, and, through an ostentatious parade of prayer, seeks to effect the conversion of men by direct interposition of Divine power, thus setting aside the freedom of the will, and practically making God responsible for the present rebellious state of the world. From this doctrine we turn away in disgust, and though we sympathize with the purpose which these earnest men have in view, we can not allow that their work, as a whole, is such as the age needs and such as God approbates.

V.—BY WHAT NAME SHALL WE BE CALLED?

WORDS are signs of ideas, and where our words are ambiguous or indefinite, our ideas are equally confused and vague. We are apt to think that it matters little what we *call* any thing so we *know* the thing. And this is true; but unfortunately for us, since the word takes the place of the thing both in written and spoken discourse, the thing soon ceases to be known save through the word; and if this be indefinite or inapt, that is, not exactly descriptive and comprehensive of the thing it is used to represent, then the thing itself is falsely apprehended, and error is the necessary result. Names, especially, are supposed to be arbitrary and of no importance, and with the reckless "*Jūliet*," we ask:

"What's in a name? That which we call a rose,
By any other name would smell as sweet."

But this is the sophism of love, and delusive as the blindness of prejudice. "*That* which we call a rose"—that is, the *thing itself*—retains its quality of sweetness though we change its name; but in the absence of the thing, would another word represent it truly, or suggest to us its fragrance? The *thing* speaks for itself when it is present, but when it is absent, then its name speaks for it; and it will be inadequately or falsely represented, if that name is ambiguous or indefinite. Apart from special associations, we would think that there could be but little difference between a *white* rose and a *red* rose, and that it would be a matter of no moment, which one wore upon his cap or in his button-hole; but let it be understood that they are symbols of contending parties—that one stands for the "House of York," and the other for the "House of Lancaster"—and they assume at once, an import as momentous as the long struggle of these great houses for the throne of England. "The War of the Roses" is not a battle of flowers for supremacy in fragrance, but the onslaught of kings for more than thirty years, wrestling for an empire, in which eighty princes of royal blood went down, and the whole nobility of England were well-nigh annihilated. *Truly, there is much in a name.*

In names divinely given there is always special significance; and

this it is important for us to catch and keep. The name is a history, a doctrine, or a grace,—a symbol, unlike a human creed, with only substance of God's thought in it, gathered up into brief utterance, that we may write it upon our hearts and feel its significance. When Zacharias and Elizabeth brought their child of promise to be circumcised, it was not a matter of indifference with them what he should be called. They did not reason, that, "By his father's name he will be just as dear;" but they remembered the scene at the altar of incense, and the command of the angel that the name of the child should be called John, and they would take no substitute. It was a significant, a memorial name, expressive at once of the favor of God, and the gratitude of his ancient servants. JOHN, *the gracious gift of God*, so let him be called, wrote the dumb old priest upon the tablet, and immediately his tongue was loosed, in reward of his fealty. And so of that other child, the *prototokos pases kiteseos*, "the first-born of all creation;" when it was said to his mother, "Thou shalt call his name Jesus," would it have made no difference if she had disregarded the heavenly instruction, and called him Joseph, or Heli, or some other ancestral name? What would we not have lost, if the precious significance of this dear name had been thrown away, and the recognition of the blessed *Savior* had come down to us by a title of meaningless sound?

It is legitimate to apply these parallels to the name by which the Lord's redeemed people shall be called. If there be a divinely given name, or one recognized by the apostolic age, can we disregard it with impunity, or substitute another for it, without loss to the integrity and unity of the body? If we adopt a designation that is too general or one too specific, it will, in the one case, extend to other classes, and fail to convey a definite description; and, in the other, so limit the attention to special distinctions as to divert the thought in a large measure from the genuine essence that is the essential element of the being. Let us illustrate this general statement by examples of designative terms of each kind.

1. *Terms that are too general.* Of such are the Scriptural designations: 1. The Disciples; 2. The Saints; 3. The Believers; 4. The Brethren. Each of these designations applies to "the people of God;" but they are all too general to answer the purpose of a definite name. "Disciples" is a relative term; and used by itself, that is

out of relation to other limiting terms, it conveys no certain sense. One may be a disciple of Plato or of Gamaliel, equally as of Christ, and, except in such connection as clearly implies the relation of *the taught* to some definite *teacher*, it is clear that this term is altogether ambiguous and vague. All the term conveys, in and of itself, is that those to whom it is applied are scholars, pupils, or followers of some one, as a teacher in matters of learning or thought; but of whom, must be determined by other and limiting words. A disciple of *Christ*, or the disciples of *Christ*, is definite enough; but let us call ourselves "Disciples," or "The Disciples," simply, and the question at once arises, Disciples of whom? and until this is answered, the designation is vague. It expresses a relation, but not a definite one. It is too general, in that it covers more than is intended to be included by it.

Similar criticism applies to the term "Saints." "The Saints" are the *sanctified ones*, and the term is applied in the Scriptures to holy and godly men of all dispensations, and also to angels. "He loved the people; all his saints are in his hand;" and "He shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousand of his saints;" these passages are found in Deuteronomy, and were written fifteen hundred years before the Church of Christ was first established in Jerusalem, and show that the term is too comprehensive to stand alone as an adequate designation for its members. "The Believers," without a limiting genitive or other term of relation, may apply to a Jew or a Turk, or the adherents of any system of truth or doctrine whatever. If we say we are "Believers," the obvious antithesis is "Infidels;" but, unless the connection in which these words are used reveals to us the subject-matter of our belief or infidelity, we are constrained to ask, "Believers of what, or in whom?" And until this is answered, the vagueness of the designation is evident, and insoluble.

Evidently, the appellation "Brethren" is no less objectionable, on account of its vagueness. "Men and brethren" was a common form of address among the Jews, and opened most of the formal speeches reported in the New Testament. All fraternities recognize their members as brethren, and generally so address each other. Freemasons, Odd-fellows, Sons of Temperance, and even convivial clubs, delight in this endearing term of fellowship, and surely it can be no

adequate name for the followers of Christ. It is, perhaps, in itself, less suggestive of a religious character than any of the other terms which we have named. Still, it expresses a relation which belongs to the children of God, and, with proper associations, is suggestive and beautiful.

We do not deny that these terms are all Scriptural, nor that they are used in relation to the people of God; nor do we mean, in any degree, to discourage their legitimate use. Rather we delight in them as significant and beautiful. They bring to us conceptions of ourselves and of our relations that can not be too constantly or vividly cherished. Are we "Disciples?" Then is Christ our teacher. We must sit at his feet and learn of him. The humility of little children must be ours, and the authority of the Master must be supreme. His word is the revelation of a new light, and his guidance the new and only way to eternal life. Are we saints? Then must we be consecrated to a holy and godly life, fit temples for the indwelling of the Spirit, and separated in profession and conversation, by covenant with God, from the love and vanity of the world. Are we "believers?" Then is our trust in the Lord. We walk by faith. We can do all things through Him that strengtheneth us. We lay hold of the promises, and walk as seeing Him that is invisible. We are "anchored to that within the veil, whither the forerunner is for us entered, even Jesus." Are we "brethren?" Then should we love one another; strive to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace; and reverently and filially "bow our knees to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, from whom the whole family in heaven and on earth is named." There are blessed influences treasured up in these suggestive names, and we can not too constantly open our hearts to their power. Altogether, they designate essential vital characteristics of our life and relations; but no one of them answers the purpose of a *name*. They are *too general*.

Let us turn from these, therefore, and consider, 2. *Terms that are too specific*. Of these, the number is too great to mention. We note only a few, that are more common and representative; such as "Baptist," "Episcopalian," "Presbyterian," "Methodist," etc. We need only call the attention of the thoughtful reader to these, to expose their character. True, some names of this class are to be preferred to others, either because they designate some Scriptural

characteristic, or are, generally, more descriptive of the class of persons to whom they are applied; but they are so inadequate as to be, practically, if not intentionally, sectarian. For the most part, they are simply the distinctive badges of points of divergence and division on which parties have been formed, and by no means comprehensive of the essential characteristics of the people of God.

A "baptist" is, in strictness of derivation, a *baptizer*. John, the harbinger, was called *ho baptistes*, "the baptizer," because he baptized; but the word baptist is now used, ecclesiastically, as a contraction for anabaptist, and means one who denies the validity of infant baptism, and holds that nothing but the immersion of a penitent believer is Christian baptism. We say this is its ecclesiastic use, but anabaptist, etymologically, means one who "baptizes again," and was given because of the fact, that they to whom it was applied required all who claimed to have been baptized in infancy to be re-baptized before they could be admitted into their communion. It is a curious example of a double error: 1. Of making a *baptizer*, or one who administers the ordinance of baptism, the same as one who holds that only immersion is baptism; and, 2. Of denying that infant baptism is baptism at all, and yet calling the immersion of such, on a confession of their faith, *rebaptism*. Surely, there can be no *rebaptism* where there has been no previous baptism. True, this name was imposed by their enemies. Yet the substitution of baptist, which is accepted and worn with pride, avoids but half of the confusion.

But, apart from this inconsistency in the etymology and the use of the term, how meagre is its comprehension, compared with the character which it is employed to represent! It indicates a particular opinion as to a particular ordinance of Christianity, and this is all. Grant, as we do, that this opinion is justified by the Scriptures, and yet may not one hold it, and be very far from the kingdom of God? It may be said, that while the name of "Baptist" has only this specific meaning, it is presumed that it carries with it, by implication, all else that is essential to the character of the man or the people of God. But this is to concede its inadequacy as a name. It isolates a single feature, and individualizes and names it; but leaves all the rest to be imagined or presumed. Is it not true that Baptists themselves have felt this, and have still further distinguished

themselves by subaltern titles, which mark them into sects, and separate them into distinct and even hostile organizations? Agreeing on the ordinance of baptism, they yet differ on other questions deemed of sufficient importance to warrant a division, and this difference becomes the occasion of a new and distinctive name, till we have Baptists,—Particular, General, Free, Free-will, etc., down to the merest accidents of opinion or practice, indefinitely. Is it not beyond denial, that a name so special will not do for the designation of the people of God; and that the concession that such names are to be imposed, and made the mark of citizenship in the kingdom of God or membership in the Church, is conducive to division and strife, and, practically, a hinderance to the union of Christians?

The terms Episcopalian and Presbyterian are formed upon Scriptural *designations*, but not upon Scriptural official *distinctions*. It is conceded by so overwhelming a weight of authority, that *episkopos* and *presbuteros* are, as official terms, interchangeable in the Scriptures, that we need not stop to argue it. The *presbuteroi* of Ephesus, for whom Paul sent from Miletus, are called by him, when they had come, *episkopoi*; and the passage (Acts xx, 12, 28) is admitted to be conclusive on the question. But, in ecclesiastic use, they are now opposed to each other, and indicate different religious organizations. As names, however, they designate simply different forms of Church organization and government. They are of a class that may be indefinitely increased; since the slightest accident of time or place, or change of theory, may be exalted into a distinction requiring a new name to designate it. Thus we have "The Cumberland Presbyterians," a geographical name, but originating in a denial of the doctrine of eternal reprobation, and in other questions concerning the extent of spiritual operation, the education of the ministry, etc., familiar to students of the history of Kentucky Presbyterianism. But what of all this does the name "Cumberland" indicate? Only the county in which the new departure originated. Then there is, or was, the distinction of "Old" and "New School," and others, political, geographical, or doctrinal, that will readily recur to the reader. The Episcopalians, too, are variously distinguished, upon similar grounds; and so Christianity seems to be a thing as multiform as the caprices of human opinion, and doomed, upon the popular custom of dividing it up and naming its distinctive parts, to a multiplication of names, numerous

as the labels of a modern museum. Who does not see that herein is a great evil, a barrier to union, and a perpetual instrument of division? No one of these parties, including the Methodist, whose name has not even the pretense of a Scriptural doctrine or form in it, will, for a moment, contend that its name should be imposed upon all men to make or mark them Christians, or that it is, in itself, a full and adequate *name* for the comprehensive designation of all that may rightfully claim to be acknowledged as the people of God. Nor can any deny that they are all potent instruments for perpetuating divisions. How, then, can they consistently adhere to them, and so foster a force which hinders one of the great ends for which the "World's Evangelical Alliance" has been organized, and which is perhaps the broadest question now puzzling the Protestant mind for solution?

We find in the new Testament several other titles which deserve a passing notice; such as "man of God," "servant of the Lord," and "people of God." The first of these occurs in 1 Tim. vi, 11, and 2 Tim. iii, 17. In the first passage, it is applied to Timothy himself, and in the second seems to refer particularly to men holding official position in the Church. This was the sense of this expression in the Jewish Scriptures. "Man of God" was applied to Moses (Deut. xxxiii, 1); to angelic messengers (Judg. xiii, 6); and to the prophets frequently; generally, we may say, to one specially sent to teach or instruct the people. It is highly probable, therefore, that Paul uses it in this sense in the only two passages in which it is employed in the New Testament, and that "servant of the Lord" is its precise equivalent. It is used but once in the New Testament (2 Tim. ii, 24), and is clearly applied to Timothy, officially.

The second title, or "people of God," occurs but three times in the New Testament—twice in Hebrews (iv, 9; xi, 25), and once in 1 Peter ii, 10. Its equivalent, however, "His people," occurs in other passages. In Hebrews it is used, in both passages, to indicate the Jews, or the called in Abraham; but in Peter, it is applied to the Gentiles, "Ye, who in time past were not a people, but *are* now the people of God." We can not employ this designation, therefore as the characteristic and peculiar name of the Christians. Still, it is applicable to us, and, with proper limitations, may be made definite enough. Indeed, it is ours, in a peculiar sense, to sing, "We are his people and the sheep of his pasture. Enter into his gates with

thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise ;" and to remember that "our Savior, Jesus Christ, gave himself for us, that he might redeem us from all iniquity, and purify unto himself a peculiar people, zealous of good works." (Titus ii, 14.) Still, for the reason that it is applied to others than to Christians, and is used only in a collective sense, it is not suitable for a specific or characteristic *name* for the followers of Christ.

What shall we say, then? Is there no name that the Scriptures use, that is at once significant of our essential character, comprehensive enough to embrace all allowable diversities and degrees of opinion and faith, and specific enough to limit the extent within the requisite conditions of evangelical fellowship? We think there is, and hesitate not to say, that it is the name, "Christian."

This term occurs but three times in the Scriptures. That we may have the whole scope of Scripture usage on the subject before us, we quote these passages. We quote from the common version, for there is no question of translation so far as this term is concerned. Acts xi, 26: "And the disciples were first called Christians at Antioch ;" xxvi, 28, Agrippa says to Paul, "Almost thou persuadest me to be a Christian." 1 Peter iv, 16: "Yet if *any man suffer* as a Christian, let him not be ashamed ; but let him glorify God on this behalf."

From these Scriptures we learn : 1. The origin or first application of the name (A. D. 44) ; 2. That it was so familiarly known, at the time of Paul's defense before Herod Agrippa II, as the proper designation of the disciples, that this king used it, in his reply, as their recognized name, not at Antioch only, but also at Jerusalem. This occurred about A. D. 60, or sixteen years after the name had been first given at Antioch. 3. That at the time of Peter's First Epistle (A. D. 60), the disciples were persecuted for bearing this name, and exhorted by the apostles not to be ashamed of it, but rather to glorify God on account of it. These are instructive facts. Let us consider them more fully.

The first application of this name was at Antioch, about eleven years after the first sermon of Peter, at Pentecost. How did it originate? We understand on this wise. At first, the proclamation of the Gospel was confined to the Jews. It was also mostly in Jewish synagogues that the first preachers presented its claims and offered

its salvation. But about *two* years before this event at Antioch, Peter had had the heavenly vision sent him at Joppa; the blessing of the kingdom had been, by divine order, extended to the Gentiles; and, under this special warrant, zealous men had begun to preach the Lord Jesus to them, and exhort them to obedience. Some of these who had been driven from Jerusalem upon the persecution that arose about Stephen, men of Cyprus and Cyrene, came to Antioch. Hitherto, they had preached the Word to none but the Jews only; but now they spoke to the Greeks likewise, preaching the Lord Jesus; "and the hand of the Lord was with them, and a great number believed and turned unto the Lord." Up to this time it seems that the disciples of Christ had been confounded with the Jews. The Jews had called them "Galileans" (Acts ii, 7), and "the sect of the Nazarenes" (xxiv, 5). It was a movement in the synagogues and strictly among the Jewish people, and in no very definite sense distinguishable by the world. But now, in a very marked manner, it oversteps these limitations,—it bursts the narrow bounds of Judaism, and stretches out its offered mercies to the Gentiles also. It is salvation for all the world. It rises up into a distinct manifestation of its new and characteristic life.

So revolutionary a change in the ancient landmarks of Judaism could not fail to create the wildest excitement. Light was bursting forth that could not be concealed. News of it soon reached the mother Church at Jerusalem; and true to her parental solicitude, and the ever watchful care and authority with which she guarded the men and the measures by which the growth and principles of the Church were extended, she sends forth a chosen messenger to guide and foster the new departure. Barnabas, the "son of consolation," a Levite and a citizen of Cyprus, is selected for this important mission, and "when he saw the grace of God, he was glad, and exhorted them all, that with purpose of heart they should cleave unto the Lord."

It was this Barnabas who, some time before, had introduced Paul favorably to the apostles at Jerusalem, when as yet they were afraid of him; and he it is who is now first to perceive that the door is opened for this Paul, as the apostle to the Gentiles, and to call him to enter upon the peculiar mission for which he was chosen of Christ. Paul is in temporary retirement at his native Tarsus. Thither Bar-

nabas goes to seek him, that he may bring him to Antioch. Paul could not have forgotten the divine commission which designated him to be a witness and a minister to all men, especially the Gentiles, and would spring with joy to meet this opening call for his appointed task. Hitherto, Jerusalem, the Jewish metropolis, has been the great center of evangelical labor and influence; the Jewish people, the special object of the Gospel mercy. Henceforth, another city, the Seleucian Antioch, a great Gentile metropolis, is to become also a center, from which the apostle to the Gentiles is to go forth on mightier labors than even Peter's, and in which the wider philanthropy of the Gospel is to exhibit, for the first, its power to save the Greek as well as the Jew. For a whole year, Paul and Barnabas met with this new and peculiar Church at Antioch, in which the middle wall of partition has been broken down, and Jew and Gentile are one in Christ Jesus. And it is said, "They taught much people." And it came to pass that the disciples were here first called Christians. This is the historical statement.

Who gave this name? There are *three* answers: 1. Paul and Barnabas gave it; 2. The disciples themselves assumed it; 3. The people without gave it. Those who contend that Paul and Barnabas gave the name, agree that there was a prophetic promise, which was fulfilled on this occasion. In Isaiah lxii, 2, it is written, "And the Gentiles shall see thy righteousness and all kings thy glory, and thou shalt be called by a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall name." This prophecy, it is claimed, clearly points to this signal introduction of the Gentiles. Moreover, it is argued that the Greek verb *chrematisai*, translated "were called," is in the active voice, and should be translated "they called." A few, indeed, go so far as to contend that the verb contains the idea of *calling by divine authority*, and see, in this alleged fact, a fulfillment of that part of the prophecy which promises that the "new name" shall be one "which the mouth of the Lord shall name." But all this is exceedingly fanciful. The "new name" which is promised in Isaiah lxii, 2, is expressly stated, in the fourth verse, to be *Hephzibah*, that is, "My Delight," and not, as is fancifully assumed, this name, Christian; and the interpretation put upon the Greek word *chrematisai* is not warranted by any authority of acknowledged repute among scholars. It is true that *chrematisai* is the first aorist infinitive active; but, in the first place, it is not in

construction with *autous*, "they," that is, Paul and Barnabas ; whatever *chrematisai* may mean, it expresses no action of these persons. *Semachthenai*, "they assembled with," and *didasai*, "taught," are both in agreement with *autous*, "they," meaning Paul and Barnabas, as is shown by their close connection by the conjunction *kai*, "and ;" but the *kai* is not repeated before *chrematisai* ; on the contrary, *chrematisai* is followed by the enclitic *te*, which introduces an additional clause, and refers it back to *egeneto*, "it came to pass." So that the verse means, literally, not only that it came to pass that they (Paul and Barnabas) met with the Church and taught much people, but that it came to pass, in addition to this, *te*, "that" the disciples were called, etc. It is clear, therefore, that Paul and Barnabas did not impose this name.

Did the disciples give it to themselves ? Evidently not, in the strict sense of formally imposing upon themselves or of assuming a name. If Luke had intended to say this, he would have used quite a different expression, and a different word. This word *chrematisai* is not one of the Greek words commonly used for *calling*, in the sense of giving or imposing a name. *Lego*, *kaleo*, *onomadzo*—these are the common words of the New Testament to express this action. Hence, we do not find respectable scholars contending that Luke represents the disciples as calling themselves "Christians."

Yet there is a sense in which they may be said to have given themselves this name, and it is on this account that we find this very peculiar and unusual word employed by Luke. *Chrematisai* does not mean, primarily, to call or name, at all. It means to carry on or transact a business so as to gain or get something thereby. The thing gotten will depend on the business, and the business becomes a *calling* ; and by pursuing the calling, one gets to be called by the *name of the calling*.* So also, if we devote ourselves prominently and zealously to the cause or interest of a particular leader or reformer, we get to be called by his name. This was precisely the case here. These disciples did not call themselves Christians, but, be-

* Kuehnel, on this word, in this place, says : "*Chrematisai*, first aorist infinitive active, 'nominati sunt ;' *Chrematidzein*, Atticis erat, *res agere* ; apud recentiores, *res ita agere, ut nomen adipiscaris*, hinc significatione intransitiva, *dici, nominari*," etc. *Chrematisai*, first aorist active infinitive, *were called* ; *Chrematidzein*, with the Attic writers, was, *to carry on a business* ; later, *so to carry on a business as to get a name from it* ; hence, in the intransitive signification, *to be called, to be named, etc.*

cause they were distinguished by their faith in Christ, and the zeal with which they persuaded others to call upon his name, and were also conspicuously and cruelly persecuted by the Jews for preaching Christ, they, by their conduct in these respects, got to be called, by the outside beholders, by the name of the person whom they followed and whose cause they espoused.

It is remarkable how literally we now imitate this style of speaking in our usual, and, we may say, somewhat vulgar, expressions in similar cases. Let one act in any extraordinary manner, so as that his conduct forms a characteristic, and we say of him, "*He carries on so that he will get to be called*" this, that, or the other name, whatever it may be, that expresses his peculiar habit. This is precisely the force of *chrematisai*, here. It is used in but one other place in the New Testament in this sense. In Romans vii, 3, the common version reads, "So then, if while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress." Here we have the word *chrematisei*, future indicative active, but rightly translated here, as in our passage in Acts, passively. The sense is precisely the same in both cases; the parties get their names by their conduct.

It is clearly a mistake, both of Greek and exegesis, to translate this passage in Romans (*moichalis chrematisei*), "she will act the adulteress," as is sometimes done. First, it is not the Greek idiom for this idea. Had it been Paul's purpose simply to assert the *nature*, the moral character, of such an act, he would have used the well-established Greek form for doing so, and said, as the Savior had done before him, *moichrusei*, "She will commit adultery." The act is expressed, fully and directly, by the *verb alone*, without using, as we do in English, a substantive for adultery. The precisely equivalent expression, "play, or act, the harlot," occurs frequently in the common version of the Old Testament, and is, if we mistake not, uniformly expressed in the Septuagint by the Greek verb *pormeno*, which includes the whole meaning. But it is also a mistake of Paul's purpose and of the drift of his argument, to suppose that his intention was simply to characterize the *nature of the act*. It was to state the *effect* of it upon the wife's standing, as judged by her conduct. Not what she would *do* in marrying another man while her husband was alive, but what *sentence she would bring upon herself by doing so*. Hence, Paul employs this curious form of expression, in which a verb

in the active voice, as to form, is construed with a substantive in the nominative case, as though it were an accusative, and the verb itself is translated as an intransitive. *Moichalis chrematisei* is not "an adulteress shall act or transact a business," nor yet that a married woman "will act the adulteress;" but, by well-established Greek usage from the days of Polybius, it is properly translated, "shall be called an adulteress," or, as we would prefer, "counted an adulteress." For Paul's argument contemplates the legal effect of the judgment in the supposed case.

Having, as we think, thus established the position that the name "Christian" was originally given to the disciples by the people without, because of their public confession of Christ as their Savior, the question next arises, Did the disciples consent to this name, and wear it as an honor? We think they did. This seems to be implied in the language of Peter already quoted. He says, "If any among you suffer as a Christian, let him not be ashamed; but let him glorify God in this behalf," or, as the version of the "Bible Union" has it, "in this name," following another and well-supported reading of the original. That the name was generally given by their opponents, and those even who felt no particular hostility to them of any sort, is abundantly evident.* It took its rise as the popular distinctive appellation of the members composing the first public organization of Gentile converts. It marked a most important and revolutionary step in the progress of the Church, when it first stood out distinctly before the world, as separate from Judaism, and avowedly upon Christ, as at once its founder and ever living head. It described, definitely and comprehensively, precisely what they were. If disciples, it explained *of Christ*; if saints, because Christ was made unto them *sanctification*; if believers, because "through Christ is the forgiveness of sins, and by him all that believe are justified from all things; and, if brethren, because they are all of one family, having received the adoption of sons, through redemption, which is in Christ Jesus. So that in this name they could say, "Let no man glory in men, for all things are ours, whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come; all are ours; and we are Christ's, and Christ is God's." (1 Cor. iii, 22, 23.)

* See Tacitus. *Annals* xv, 64, *Auctor nominis ejus Christus*, etc.

We conclude, then, that it is clear, that whilst the first Gentile disciples, together with such of the Jews as stood apart with them in the Church of Antioch, received this name from the pagans, they not only wore it willingly, but rejoiced to be thought worthy of it; and that, very soon, it became the universally adopted designation of the followers of Christ. That it was by many given in derision is no doubt true, but equally true, we do not question, is it that by the greater number it was used merely as a distinctive appellation, just as Galilean, Herodian, Pharisee, or Sadducee, without any special feeling either of partiality or prejudice. It was the publicly recognized name of the primitive disciples, known and used of all men, and gloried in by the true followers of Christ. Let us also recognize it, and glorify God in honoring it, as the one common and universal name under which we will labor to restore the unity of his people.

From the name of the members we pass to the consideration of the name of the body which they compose—their constitutional name. And here we notice, in the outset, that, of the many characteristic *personal* names which occur in the Scriptures, no one of them is ever used to designate the one body, constitutionally considered, and which is uniformly called in the New Testament, *ekklesia*, "the Church." We nowhere meet with the "Saint Church," the "Disciple Church," the "Believer Church," the "Brethren Church." Neither do we find other forms of this principle of naming, such as, "Disciples' Church," etc., or "Church of the Disciples," etc., ever used, as a name. True, we have in one instance, the expression, "Churches of the saints" (1 Corinthians xiv, 33); but here the apostle Paul means Churches composed of Jewish Christians, as in comparison with those of the Gentile converts.* We can not take the expression as a common, designative name of the organic body, generally applicable to all; but as a personal characteristic, by way of contrast between individuals of the same class, distinguished as to the nationality of which they were respectively compared. So that the expression is not a common name applicable to all, but a circumstantial distinction, like the geographical appendages, "of Galatia," "of Macedonia," etc.

This last class of names, that is, names specifically distinctive of parts of the body or Church universal, organized in different geo-

* The expression, "Church of the first-born" (Hebrews xii, 23), is not involved in this discussion.

graphical districts, is common in the New Testament ; but their very purpose is restrictive, and, of course, the particular limiting terms can not be any part of a truly generic characteristic. Yet the word *ekklesia* needs some limiting term to give it the definiteness necessary for the name of an organized body of the Lord's people ; for, of itself, it means simply a "congregation," or an "assembly," and it is applicable to "congregations" of different classes of people, and for different purposes. What shall this term be? What shall we connect with the word *ekklesia* to designate what sort of an *ekklesia* we mean?

Custom has made us familiar with the term "Christian," and it is not uncommon to find this urged as the Scriptural and satisfactory solution of the whole difficulty as to "the name" "the Christian Church ;" this, it is said, should harmonize all differences, and be adopted as at once catholic and distinctive enough to fulfill all conditions. But, in the first place, let it be noted that this is not a Scriptural name. Nowhere in the New Testament do we find it employed, either by the disciples themselves or by their enemies. We make the objection stronger and more general by affirming that nowhere do the writers of the New Testament, or any of them, *ever employ any adjective designation, expressive of a quality of the members of the Church, to limit and characterize the word "ekklesia," as the organic name of the disciples.* I beg the reader, who is concerned to distinguish Bible ideas through Bible words, to ponder this sentence, which I have just marked by italics.

"In no instance," says Coleridge, "has the false use of a word become current without some practical ill consequence, of far greater moment than would, *primo aspectu*, have been thought possible ;" and it was not a bad idea of a facetious friend of his, who suggested the "appointing of a verbarian Attorney-General, with authority to bring information, *ex officio*, against the writer or editor of any work in extensive circulation, who, after due notice issued, should persevere in misusing a word." Particularly do we insist upon calling Bible things by Bible words ; and here we repeat, the Bible gives no authority for calling "the Church" *Christian* as its distinctive name, or of so designating it by any other adjective which merely expresses a personal or subjective quality or characteristic of its members. To do so is false in fact and false in thought. Can we not have a *Christian*

assembly that is not a "Church?" Any congregation composed of Christians, in fact or in name, may be so designated. The term Christian, as an adjective prefix, may be used, and is, of an entire nation, in the broad sense of antithesis to Jewish, heathen, or Moham-medan, but we find no such vagueness in the New Testament. The Scriptural *thought* as to the Church is different.

On the contrary, we notice, in the second place, that, "the Church" is not named so much with reference as to its *subjects*, the disciples, as it is with a reference to its *Founder*, Christ. In the very first use of the word found in the New Testament, the Savior says, "I will build my Church." He is "the head of the Church;" "The Church is his body;" "The Church is subject to Christ;" "He loved the Church, and gave himself for it, that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the Word, that he might present it to himself a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing, but that it should be holy and without blemish." In all these passages the radical conception is, that, in a very definite sense, the Church is a foundation of Christ. He *builds* it and he is *the head* of it. It is not an institution of man; is not to be considered as in any sense subject to his legislation, modification, or discretion. It is not a society that we form and which has its character from our will, but it is of divine appointment, and is, and must forever remain, such as the Founder has constituted it. Hence, under the conception of this relation, we have once (Romans xvi, 16) the expression, "the Churches of Christ."

But the common and preferred name in the New Testament is, "the Church of God." With a slight modification in a single case, we have this name used eleven times. It is the *one* comprehensive and specific designation of the apostle Paul, with the single exception of the passage in Romans, above cited. Luke uses it once in Acts, and we can not doubt that it was generally implied in those passages where "Church" alone is used, throughout the New Testament. If, in this undesigned use of *ekklesia*, any writer of the New Testament had been asked, "What Church do you mean?" who can hesitate to believe that the answer would have been, "The Church of God." It is called "the house of God" (1 Timothy iii, 15); and under this conception, God is contemplated as dwelling in it and filling it with his glory; so fulfilling the sublime type of the Tem-

ple of Solomon, when, at its dedication, He who dwelleth not in temples made by human hands symbolized the pouring out of his Spirit into the Church, and his constant abiding with his saints, through it, to bless and comfort them forever.

These radical conceptions are constantly recognized in the name which inspiration has given to the Church. They are integral thoughts in its constitution. Are we baptized into the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit? So then, we are added to "the Church of God." We make not a Church by voluntary association, but we are added to one of God's ordaining, founded in the work of his Son, administered by his Holy Spirit, and existing for his glory. How the name exalts the nature of the Church! "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it!" Do men believe this of the *adjective* names by which we designate our divisions and distinctions? of any thing that has the stamp of a human origin upon it? Would they *despise* "the Church of God," as they do, very often, the "Baptist Church," the "Disciples' Church," and Churches of other names, that they believe factionists and ambitious leaders have organized of their own will, and founded upon their own opinions and authority? Would we adhere to the Bible name, "Church of God"—which is at once comprehensive of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—could we even *express* our divisions and give them a name to live under? Is not the fearful evil of sectarianism fostered by this false use of words, and have we not here an example of how, by abandoning the words, we lose the ideas of Scripture, and involve ourselves in endless confusions concerning the true basis of union among the people of God?

Let us return to the name divinely imposed upon us; let us keep clearly and sharply before us the conception of sovereign authority and divine institution which it expresses, and, abandoning all others, seek in it the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace.

VI.—IS THERE A PERSONAL DEVIL?

PROVE ALL THINGS.

THE modern school of criticism is subjecting every thing in religion to the severest tests. Christians certainly have no good reason to complain of this. Doubtless, much that has been regarded as sacred will not be able to stand the ordeal. But this is only because much that has been regarded as sacred is false, and ought, therefore, to perish in the presence of the truth. No earnest, intelligent Christian wants any thing to remain in his religious system that will not stand the test of legitimate criticism. Hence, we say let the investigation go on; good will come of it. Iconoclasts may, for a time, destroy too much; but a reaction, which is sure to follow, will generally settle things about the right place. We need, therefore, have no alarm, because now and then we feel the shock of a slight earthquake shaking the pillars of our Christian temple. These shocks are perhaps necessary to keep us on the constant lookout for the strength of our foundations, and will make us all the more careful not to build on "wood, hay, or stubble." And we think it will be also seen, when the battle is over, that our faith has not only been able to stand against the most determined onslaught ever made upon it, but that it has gained some immense advantages—advantages that will be of the greatest service to the cause of Christianity in the future.

THE FIRST POINT OF ATTACK.

We think it may be safely affirmed that, nearly always, the first point of attack of modern infidelity on the Bible is the personality of the Devil. It is believed that if this august personage can be annihilated, or reduced to a mere abstraction, then the final success of skepticism is practically assured. Nor can we doubt the correctness of this logic. For, if the personality of Satan can be explained away, we do not see why all personality may not be explained away, and so run every thing into the worst form of Pantheism. But there is a peculiar temptation to skeptics at this point. If the doctrine of a personal Devil is not true, then a large restraining influence is at

once taken away from those who wish to overthrow the authority of the Scriptures. It may be that infidels are braver and better than other people, but even then it is by no means certain they are never influenced by their fears. Hence, it is a necessity of infidelity to get rid, as soon as possible, of all idea of a personal Devil and future punishment. There can be no progress toward the destruction of the Christian religion until this idea is completely destroyed. And in this work of destruction, infidelity is greatly assisted by superstition. The past is full of excesses on this subject which are eagerly appropriated by the enemies of truth and made to tell in shaping the faith of the people.

ABUSE OF THE DOCTRINE.

That the doctrine of the existence of a personal Devil has frequently been greatly abused, we do not for one moment question. But this, we think, can not be received as satisfactory evidence against the truth of the doctrine itself. Nearly every thing has been abused. Even Christianity has not escaped in this particular. Some of the grossest outrages on good society and the best interests of humanity have been committed in the name of the Christian religion. Is the Christian religion false on that account? And must we henceforth regard it as a myth of the dark ages, whose influence has always been most felt where ignorance and superstition most largely prevailed? If such is our method of reasoning, then we may as well, at once, give up all hope of reaching just conclusions with regard to any thing, and content ourselves with repeating the sentiment of the poet,

"When ignorance is bliss, 't is folly to be wise."

And yet those who argue against the doctrine of a personal Devil, because they can refer to periods in history when this doctrine was greatly abused, are guilty of precisely the same kind of logical fallacy as in the case we have supposed against Christianity. The truth is, this question can not be settled by any such methods of reasoning. It is not a question as to how the doctrine has influenced the world, either for good or evil, but it is a question of *fact*, and must therefore be determined, like all questions of this kind, by proper and legitimate testimony. What, then, is the testimony on this subject?

HISTORICALLY CONSIDERED.

The existence of evil is a fact that has been accounted for in various ways, but is so self-evident and so constantly present in human history as never to have been denied. Origen regarded it as only the negation of good; Leibnitz, as threefold—metaphysical, physical, and moral; Kant, as twofold—absolute and relative; that is, opposed to the absolutely or the relatively good. But, whatever may be the explanation, it is always conceded that evil exists, that it is a terrible fact in human history, and that it can not be eliminated from that history by any explanation that may be given. But there is a question still behind this, that has occupied the most thoughtful consideration of the wisest philosophers and theologians of all ages. We refer to the origin or source of evil.

In explanation of this, the two theories most dominant among mankind prior to the Christian era were the Dualistic and Pantheistic theories, and these have had their respective advocates ever since, even among Christian philosophers.

DUALISM.

The Dualistic theory is of great antiquity, and is of Oriental origin, though it is not certain with whom it first originated. It is found to-day as a prominent element in at least two of the oldest and most widely spread religions of the East; namely, Parseeism and Buddhism.

According to this theory, "good and evil are two distinct essences, produced by two original principles—one of good, and one of evil—from whose agency all the good and evil existing in the world have respectively flowed." This theory assumed two distinct forms:

1. *Parseeism*. In the religion of the ancient Persians it is affirmed that the universe was created by two rival powers, Ormuzd and Ahriman—that is, light and darkness—the latter of whom though in no particular subordinate to the former, is somewhat inferior, and is destined finally to be overcome.

This view has had a wide influence on the religions of the world, and is one of the prominent doctrines of the Zend Avesta.

2. *Hylism*. This taught that matter is an original principle of evil co-existent from eternity with God, and was regarded as either

feminine and passive, as in the Chinese cosmogony, or as neuter, a kind of formless mass, as among the Greeks.

This is really the root of modern Materialism. Starting with this physical idea of evil, it is not strange that many have carried the doctrine to its logical consequences. The grossest Materialism is its legitimate offspring.

PANTHEISM.

The Pantheistic theory does not treat evil as something essentially different from good, but regards good and evil as only varying manifestations of one original principle. This is the basis of Brahminism, the religion of India, and has appeared, in a modified form, in several places since the Christian era. In the seventeenth century it appeared in the philosophy of Spinoza, and in the nineteenth in the philosophy of Schelling.

As a system, Pantheism denies not only the existence of a personal Devil, but also of a personal God. It makes God the soul of the world, and is therefore distinguished, on the one hand, from Materialism, according to which God and nature are immediately identical; and, on the other hand, from Theism, which ascribes creation to a personal God. It is easy to see how such a philosophy as this would at once repudiate the doctrine of a personal Devil; and it is easy to see, furthermore, why it should be selected as the most promising battle-ground on which to successfully meet this doctrine.

This Pantheistic theory is just now assuming considerable importance, especially in several of the countries of Europe. For the last thirty years it has been very popular in Germany, though there is at this time growing up a very decided reaction against it. The decline of Rationalism in the universities is, of course, followed by a corresponding change of opinion on this subject; for Rationalism is really the offspring of the Pantheistic philosophy. This theory, to a certain class of minds, has some very special attractions. It is claimed for it that it is both historical and reasonable. It is historical, because the primitive races of mankind knew nothing of evil as an essentially different thing from good; and that, as men become more and more enlightened, they will in the same ratio adopt the primitive idea. Whether these high claims can be sustained or not will be determined after we have stated

THE BIBLE VIEW

of this subject. It is generally believed that the Holy Scriptures clearly teach the following:

1. That all evil is caused by a malignant spirit hostile to God, and called the Devil, or Satan. (See 1 John iii, 8.)

2. That God, therefore, is himself the author of evil only in the sense that, being able to prevent it, he has permitted it to exist. (See Isaiah xlv, 7; 1 Kings xxii, 22.)

3. That, though permitted by God to exist, Satan is still under control, and made subservient to the Divine purpose. (See Proverbs xvi, 4.)

4. That God will ultimately overrule the machinations of Satan to his own glory, when all evil will be seen by us to have been in complete accordance with perfect order and supreme rectitude. (See Romans ix, 22, 23.)

We have here what may be regarded as a complete summary of Bible teaching as to the origin of evil, and its relations to God and humanity. And this Bible teaching, we believe, is of primary importance in coming to any just conclusions about the matter; for, just as soon as we rule the Bible testimony out, we are completely at sea, without the possibility of reaching any safe landing-place. It becomes us, therefore, to study with the most profound reverence and critical attention, what the Bible says upon the subject. We ask, therefore, the reader's earnest attention to the doctrine of the Devil, as we find it in the Word of God.

Passing over the Jewish Scriptures for the present, we find in the New Testament the word *Diabolos*, or Devil, thirty-eight times. Of these, thirty-four are preceded by the definite article *the*, and, without doubt, refer to the great Adversary, to whom we have attributed the origin of evil. Of the remaining four cases, one is where Jesus calls one of the twelve a devil, not *the* Devil; and the other three are where Paul applies the term to men and women such as do not restrain their tongues. Thus it will be seen that we have *ho Diabolos* thirty-four times; *diabolos*, without the article, applied to Judas, a false accuser and slanderer, once; and three times to designate slanderers, false accusers, etc. (1 Timothy iii, 11; 2 Timothy iii, 3; Titus ii, 3.) Hence, we have in the New Testament the word

Devil, as a proper name, thirty-four times, and always applied to *ho Satanas*, the great Adversary of human souls.

The word Satan occurs thirty-seven times in the New Testament, and only twice without the article, in both of which cases it is applied to Peter, as an adversary.

Thus we reach the inevitable conclusion that the New Testament recognizes a malignant personality, hostile to God and bent on the ruin of man. To deny this conclusion is to set at naught the plainest meaning of the Greek language, which, with singular exactness, puts the personality of Satan beyond the possibility of successful controversy.

ORIGIN OF SATAN.

The fact that we have ascribed evil to a malignant spirit, called, in the Bible, Satan, at once suggests the inquiry as to his origin. He comes into human history in the Garden of Eden. He there plays the part of a tempter in leading Adam and Eve away from the Divine commandment. But what was his antecedent history? How came he, an evil spirit, in open rebellion against the government of God? It is more than probable we can not answer these questions with entire satisfaction. But this should not in any way weaken our faith in the present existence of such a being. We can not satisfactorily explain the origin of very many of the most obvious facts of history; but our ignorance as to the origin of these does not break down our faith in their existence. With all the boasted advance of natural science very few things can yet be traced to their origin, and that origin thoroughly understood. Rationalists often make themselves exceedingly silly, and stultify their own theories, by rejecting the revelation of God because there are some things in that revelation which they can not satisfactorily account for.

We state all this, because we wish it distinctly understood that the existence of a personal Devil is in no way dependent on whether we can or can not explain the origin of such a being. It is quite enough to know that such a being had an existence contemporaneous with the first man, and that through his instrumentality sin was introduced into the world. That sin is in existence can not be denied, and no philosophy can *a priori*, contradict its history; neither can any philosophy deny it, *a posteriori*; and it is just as difficult to account for this as for the origin of Satan. In fact, it is easier to

account for the history of sin on the hypothesis we have suggested than on any other.

Nevertheless, there are places in the Scriptures that give us at least a suggestion as to the origin of Satan. That he was an angel of high rank, there can be no doubt; and that he fell from this position and became the wicked malignant spirit he now is, is also just as certain. But precisely how he fell, what influences operated upon him to produce his fall, and how far this fall affected the spiritual world, as it then existed, are questions that may never be determined by the light which we now possess. We read of "angels that kept not their first estate," that were "cast down to hell," and as Satan was evidently a leader among these, it is probable that in his rebellion against God he carried with him a portion of the angel world. Some have thought that pride was the moving cause in his rebellion. This may have been so. Thirst for power has always been a ruling motive with great intelligences. It may have been that Satan's ambition was the prime cause of his final overthrow as one of the angels.

But, as before remarked, we are not so much concerned with these questions as we are with the actual existence of Satan to-day as the representative and instigator of evil. And it is in this light that we ask the reader to consider him; for it is in this light that the Bible reveals him, "going about seeking whom he may devour." And it is just this fact of his personal existence that we have so clearly indicated in the *Greek* of the New Testament Scriptures. *Ho Diabolos* stands out as a distinct and definite personality, and no sentimental sophistry will likely ever overthrow this conclusion.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THE DEVIL AND DEMONS.

Unfortunately for us, we have another word in the New Testament which is almost uniformly translated devil. We refer to the word *Daimoon*. This word, with its families, occurs seventy-nine times in the New Testament, and is always translated devil or devils, with a single exception, found in Acts xvii, where it is translated "gods." This fact is certainly very significant, and suggests at once the origin of much of the confusion in the public mind on this subject. Clearly, no well-defined conception of the Devil can be had from the New Testament unless we properly discriminate between *Diabolos* and *Diamoon*. This is just what the common version does not do, and,

hence, the ignorance of the people in reference to this important matter. But if we will constantly keep before our minds the following points, we will be enabled to arrive at very satisfactory conclusions:

1. *Diabolos*, translated devil, and *Daimonion*, which ought always to be translated demon, are, in their New Testament use, never confounded. The one is never in any case substituted for the other, notwithstanding they occur, when taken together, ninety-four times in the New Testament.

2. *Daimonion* is as constantly indefinite as *Diabolos* is definite. Devil is always preceded by the definite article "the;" *Daimoon* never, except when some particular one is named in reference to a special case.

3. *Diabolos*, or the Devil, is never, in the Bible, said to take possession of any one.

4. Demons are constantly represented as malignant and unclean spirits, and to their influence is ascribed "dumbness," "deafness," "palsy," "epilepsy," etc.

5. Paul teaches that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice they sacrificed to demons, and not to God. And as we know that the Gentiles did sacrifice to hero-gods, we conclude that these hero-gods were demons, or the spirits of dead men.

DEMONOLOGY.

That the New Testament is not peculiar in these respects, we need only refer to the Demonology of the world. All nations have more or less recognized the New Testament doctrine of demons. The words *Daimoon* and *Daimonion* are used by both profane and sacred writers as synonymous, and by the first class of writers, with considerable latitude of meaning. While we may not be able to determine with definite certainty what these demons are, we think the following facts will be sufficient for all practical purposes:

1. The demons of the Gentiles were of two kinds. The one were the souls of dead men. The souls of *good* men, upon their departure from the body, were called heroes, after which they were raised to the dignity of demons, and then to that of gods. (*Plut., De Defect. Orac.*) It was also believed that the souls of *bad* men became evil demons. Hence, *Daimonios* often occurs in ancient authors as a term of reproach. The *other* kind of demons never inhabited human bodies, and were therefore of more noble origin.

2. These demons occupied a middle ground between gods and mortals. Plato says: "Every demon is a middle being between God and mortal;" and then explains what he means by a middle being as follows: "God is not approached immediately by man, but all commerce and intercourse between gods and men are performed by the mediation of demons." Hence, "demons are reporters, and carriers from men to the gods, and again from the gods to men, of the supplications and prayers of the one, and of the injunctions and rewards of devotion from the other." (*Plato, Sympos.*)

3. Josephus uses the word demon always in a *bad* sense. He distinctly declares, "that demons are no other than the spirits of the wicked, that enter into men and kill them, unless they can obtain some help against them." He makes no reference to the other view as held by heathen writers.

4. Turning now to the New Testament again, and examining such passages as Matt. viii, 16; x, 1; xii, 43-45; Mark ix, 20; Luke x, 20; Mark i, 24; Luke iv, 34; James ii, 19; iii, 14; Matt. viii, 28-32; Mark ix, 26; Eph. vi, 12; we find whatever else these demons may have been, they were *spirits*, and had *intelligence* and *will*, but, as to personality, they were never confounded with the prince of demons, *ho Diabolos*.

We think we can now affirm, with considerable emphasis, that the New Testament distinction between the Devil and demons is fatal to the whole Pantheistic philosophy concerning the origin of evil. While the doctrine of demons, as it is understood by Pantheists, may not be inconsistent with the historical notions of our modern evolutionists, the fact of a personal Devil, wholly distinct from demons, remains yet unexplained, and can not be explained, so far as we can see, on either the Dualistic or Pantheistic theories.

PERSONALITY OF SATAN.

That this Bible Devil has personality, is shown not only from the considerations already presented, but also from the following facts:

1. He has a *mind* ascribed to him. The fact that he designs, clearly implies the possession of a mind. Hence, when we read of his moving David to number Israel (2 Samuel xxiv, 1); putting into the hearts of Ananias and Sapphira to lie to the Holy Ghost (Acts v, 3); desiring to sift Peter as wheat (Luke xxii, 31); tempting Christ

(Mark i, 13); and deceiving the whole world (Rev. xii, 9); we can not doubt, for a moment, that all this implies mind, and that too of unusual strength.

2. He is said to exercise dominion. He is denominated "the god of this world, the prince of the power of the air" (Eph. ii, 2); also, "the Devil and his angels" (Matt. xxv, 41); and he is said to work in the children of disobedience (Eph. ii, 2).

3. He is known by several names. Besides the names Devil and Satan he is called "The Adversary," "Apollyon," "Beelzebub," "Belial," "Dragon," "Serpent," and "Lucifer." The following titles are also assigned to him in the New Testament: "The angel of the bottomless pit" (Rev. ix, 11); "the prince of devils" (Matt. xii, 24); "the prince of this world" (2 Cor. iv, 4); "the accuser of our brethren" (Rev. xii, 10); "the tempter"—*ho peiradsoon*—(Matt. ix, 3); "the deceiver"—*ho planoon*—(Rev. xx, 10).

4. There are works ascribed to him. We read of "the working of Satan" (2 Thess. ii, 9); and "the works of the Devil" (1 John iii, 8).

5. He is likewise represented as possessing character. We are told that he is a deceiver (Rev. xii, 9), and a murderer (John viii, 44). He is also described as "the wicked one" (1 John iii, 12); as a liar (John viii, 44); and the tempter (Matt. iv, 3).

6. He is declared to exercise the faculty of will. Paul speaks of persons caught in "the snare of the Devil, who are taken captive at his will" (2 Tim. i, 26); and this faculty is clearly implied in many other passages.

7. And finally, a fate is assigned him. He is, with all his angels, delivered into chains of darkness, reserved unto judgment (2 Peter ii, 4); and "everlasting fire" is prepared for him (Matt. xxv, 41).

It will be seen, from this induction of references in the Scriptures, that attributes, character, names, actions, and the fate of a person, are all ascribed to the Devil. The sacred writers use all the forms of personal agency in setting forth the character and conduct of Satan. They describe him as having power and dominion, messengers and followers. He exercises those qualities of mind which can only be predicated of personality. He tempts and resists, is held accountable and charged with guilt. Finally, there is to be a day of reckoning for him. He is to be judged, and to receive punishment.

Now, it seems to us, that the most imaginative mind can scarcely escape the conclusion that the Bible gives to the great Adversary a very distinct and definite personality. And we, furthermore, believe that no scientific interpretation of the Bible can possibly reach any other conclusion. To assume that all the passages of Scripture referred to are to be understood metaphorically, is to practically deny the real existence of a spiritual universe. What do we know of God and of angels? Have we seen them at any time? Are we not wholly dependent upon their revealed attributes, characters, names, works, and states for all the knowledge we have concerning them? Now, Satan is represented as possessing all these, and hence, it is just as legitimate to ascribe to him personality as to ascribe it to God, Christ, or Gabriel. And then it should be remembered that nowhere in the Bible is his personality denied. There is not the slightest hint given, from the beginning of Genesis to the last of Revelation, that he is simply a metaphorical being—a sort of representation of the principle of evil, or only a theological scarecrow for the benefit of imaginative revivalists, or cross old women who wish to force obedience from their unruly children. True, the first representation we have of Satan is in the form of a serpent. But this in no way militates against the doctrine of his personality. What do we know of the forms of spiritual beings? Why is it incompatible with their natures to appear on this scene of action in any form they may choose? Pantheists may make light of the scene of Eden to their hearts' content, but, while it remains true that God himself has appeared in human form, we must ask to be excused, if we fail to see any thing particularly absurd and unhistorical in the assumption that Satan actually appeared in the form of a serpent, in his first conflict with the human race.

We are aware that Pantheistic philosophers are not very partial to personality, even when ascribed to God himself. And in this respect, at least, they are consistent; for the same line of reasoning that will destroy the personality of the Devil will also destroy the personality of God. And when you have assumed that Satan, hell, everlasting punishment, etc., are only figures of speech, it does not take long to come to the conclusion that God, heaven, eternal life, etc., are likewise figures of speech. Thus we would reduce the whole Bible to a sort of fanciful poetry, and its most solemn

and awful words to little more than the playthings of the imagination.

What sad havoc does this method of interpretation make of God's Word! We have been accustomed to regard the Scriptures as teaching, upon their very surface, the existence of two great spiritual armies—God and his angels on one side, and the Devil and his angels on the other—and that the mission of Christ to man was to destroy the works of the Devil, and bring salvation to a lost and ruined world. But if this Pantheistic method of interpretation be accepted, then there is great truth in the words of Strauss, when he says: "If Christ is come to destroy the works of the Devil, he need not have come, if there is no Devil; if there is a Devil, but only as the personification of an evil principle, then are we satisfied with a Christ as an impersonal idea." Furthermore, on the Pantheistic hypothesis, it is no longer necessary to recognize a supernatural redemption; for, if we assert that we have no other strife except against "flesh and blood," and that sin only springs from 'man himself, without recognizing a superhuman power of evil, then the tragic scene of Calvary was not only a most ridiculous farce, but becomes a stigma upon the character of God himself, in permitting his own Son to endure such painful agony, when there was no other purpose in view than a sort of exhibition of fortitude, as an example for the world. It may be that such wild interpretations of Scripture, as we have indicated, will lead superficial thinkers to make merry over the dogma of a personal Devil, but it will be a long while before thoughtful and serious people will see in this merriment an explanation of the conscious fact of sin, as well as its terrible consequences, as revealed in the Bible.

THE DEVIL IN HISTORY.

Recently, we heard a very interesting lecture, in which the lecturer emphasized his belief that the Devil of modern times was not known in the primitive age of the world; in fact, was not known, even in Jewish history, until after their return from their captivity in Babylon. Now, it is freely admitted that the Old Testament says very little about the Devil, and yet what it does say, fixes his personality beyond the possibility of a doubt. The scene in Eden has already been referred to. But this is not all. No one, we think, can read the trial of Job, and witness the machinations of the evil one, who not

only appeared among the children of God, but who actually talked with Job face to face, without feeling that any interpretation which would exclude a personal Devil from this history would do such violence to language as to make all intelligible communication simply impossible. Then there are other instances, such as tempting David to number Israel, that make it very evident that the Jews had at least some idea of Satan's character, even before the Babylonish captivity.

The argument of the lecture assumed that the Persian Dualism was the source of the historic Devil among the Jews. But why not assume that the Jewish notion of the Devil was the source of the Persian Dualism? Certainly, the book of Job can lay claim to as much antiquity as the Zend Avesta. In fact, there are not a few scholars who are ready to believe that Job himself was no other than the Old Testament Melchizedek. But however this may be, there is no trustworthy proof that the Jews received their notions of Satan from the Persian theology. A great deal of nonsense has been written and spoken on this subject. The Persian Dualism is very different, in many important particulars, from the Jewish idea. There are some points of similarity, but these are insignificant compared with the points of difference. We notice, 1. That Judaism held to a pure Theism. 2. It held to the absolute sovereignty of God. These two things, so prominent in Judaism, made it next to impossible for the Jews to accept the Persian Dualism.

The lecturer made another point to which we wish to call special attention. He emphasized the fact that the idea of a Devil had been exceedingly prominent in history. Now, we would like to ask how it is that that idea came into existence? Men tell us that it was not found in the primitive age of the world, but was an after-thought, when men had found it necessary to provide some such being, in order to account for the disorders of mankind. Let us see if Paul does not give us a better explanation of the matter than this. In the first chapter of Romans he says: "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men, who hold the truth in unrighteousness. Because that which may be known of God is manifest in them; for God hath shewed it unto them. For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made,

even his eternal power and Godhead ; so that they are without excuse. Because that, when they knew God, they glorified him not as God, neither were thankful ; but became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools, and changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things. Wherefore God also gave them up to uncleanness through the lusts of their own hearts, to dishonor their own bodies between themselves. Who changed the truth of God into a lie, and worshiped and served the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever. Amen."

It will be seen by these statements that men lost the knowledge of even God himself at a very early period in their history—that is, "they changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and to four-footed beasts, and to creeping things." They did not lose all idea of God, but they lost the *true* idea of him. In the dispersion of mankind, this corrupted idea of the Deity was carried into different parts of the world, and doubtless furnished the germ for the subsequent development of the various religions of the East.

This is a point which we think has not been sufficiently considered. In looking for the origin of religions, the only safe starting-place is the dispersion after the Flood. At that time, doubtless, men had a common religion, and this religion was received from the true and living God. But after the dispersion, the various modifying circumstances to which the several nations were exposed changed this original religion into the religions which afterward ruled the world. Hence, all the old religions, such as Brahminism, Parseeism, Buddhism, etc., are corruptions of the religion which men had when the confusion of tongues drove them into various parts of the world. This fact not only accounts for image worship, but also for the Monotheistic idea which is so prominent in the older religions.

Now, it is easy to see how an inherited tradition of Satan may have also exerted itself in shaping the development of human history. Doubtless, there was at first a very distinct revelation of the Satanic character ; but the true idea gradually became lost in various superstitions, until the Satanology of many nations became just equal to their demonology. And it was not until the New Testament brought

out clearly the distinction between *Diabolos* and *Daimoon* that a reaction began toward a true Satanology.

We think we have here the key also to the excesses of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, in reference to Satanic influence. With the downfall of primitive Christianity came a perverted idea of Satan, and this led to the burning of witches, and all the abominations which disgraced our humanity during the reign of ignorance and superstition. These excesses started another reaction; but as "extremes beget extremes," we will have to be careful, unless this reaction will carry us too far. This is our present danger, and it is worth while to guard against it.

But to return to the reasons why so little is said about Satan in the Old Testament. We think it is easy to see that no prominent mention was needed in the history of the remedial system, until the time had come when the "seed of the woman" was to "bruise the serpent's head;" or, in other words, until the coming of Christ, when a sharp and vigorous contest would be inaugurated between good and evil, light and darkness, the power of Satan and the power of God.

Then there is another reason why so little is said about Satan in the Old Testament. The rewards and punishments of the Jewish system were purely temporal—they did not look beyond this life. In fact, it is doubtful whether the Jews had as vivid conception of a future life as they had of a personal Devil. At any rate, it is certain that their law made little or no provision for such a life. In such a system it was not necessary to make prominent the true idea of the origin of evil. But under the Christian dispensation, rewards and punishments are largely reserved for the future. The present is a state of self-denial and struggle; the future, the time of dispensing "to every man according as his works shall be." The revelation of God in Christ is that of an incarnate God, and along with this comes the revelation of a very distinct personality of him who is the adversary of both God and man.

While the Jewish age lasted, a clear discovery of the proper mystery of unrighteousness would have been premature, and would doubtless have promoted the worship of demons in Israel, thereby seriously injuring Monotheism; and as Monotheism was, at that age of the world, the only safety against idol worship and its ten thousand accompanying evils, it appears to us that it was precisely in harmony

with the true law of development that little should be said about Satan in the religion of the Jews. In this connection the following suggestion, by Professor Townsend, may help to account for the little that is said of Satan in the Old Testament:

"If we mistake not, God has been infinitely merciful to Satan, and has tried every way to effect this restoration. If we reason correctly, God waited thousands of years, even until the coming of Christ, for this child, this wayward prodigal, to return. It was not until longer forbearance would have been an offense to the universe, that Satan was pronounced an irrecoverable reprobate. Through thousands of years he grew no better; nay, seems to have become worse and worse. During the life of Jesus, the Satanic spirit rose to its height. Satan saw, no doubt, that unless he conquered Jesus in the wilderness, or on the pinnacle of the temple, or on the mountain-top, or in the Garden of Gethsemane, his habitation on earth must end; it was in those mad, reckless, and terrible endeavors to destroy the only innocent being who has walked on this earth since Adam, that Satan forfeited all claim to further probation and mercy. He did irreparable damage to his moral character. Blasphemy, the worst type possible, completed his guilt. His cup of iniquity was filled to the brim. He committed the unpardonable sin. He fell as lightning from heaven, never again to enter it."*

But no matter whether these explanations be correct or not, if we accept the New Testament as our rule of faith and practice, we are bound to accept the fact of a personal Devil, as the instigator and original author of evil, unless we do violence to all the plainest laws of interpretation, and give ourselves up to a mythical theory that would destroy every promise and hope of the Bible. Hence, it will be seen that a decision on this question involves vastly more than has been supposed by some. The credibility of the Word of God is clearly involved, and this fact, we think, at once justifies the notice we have taken of the matter.

SENTIMENTAL PLATITUDES.

It is easy enough to dismiss this entire question with a few sentimental platitudes, if we wish to tickle the popular fancy and weaken the hold of God's Word on the people. But if we wish to be faithful to that Book which is the "lamp to our feet and light to our path," then we must not accept interpretations which virtually destroy the Bible, and leave us on the ocean of life without either chart or compass. In view of all these facts, may we not ask, Is not the "wish father of the thought," with those who try to get rid of a personal Devil? That

* "Lost Forever," p. 371.

this is often the case, we think there can be no question. The unregenerate heart will never cheerfully accept those passages of Scripture which bring it into condemnation and expose it to eternal ruin. And it is much easier to deal in sentimental sophistries than surrender the heart to the plain teachings of the Gospel; hence, the tendency to explain away a personal Devil, and all that side of the Bible that looks to the future punishment of the wicked. Men accept the dark side of things in the natural world, because they can not reason against what is an every-day experience; but, at the same time, they assume to reject the view of God's moral government which is supported not only by analogy, but also by the most obvious interpretations of God's Word. Truly is error always inconsistent even with itself.

SATANIC TRANSFORMATIONS.

The lecture to which we have already referred was especially able in its treatment of Satanic transformations, or the various changes in form which the Devil is supposed to have assumed in different countries and different ages of the world. While on this subject, the lecturer gave us some very grotesque pictures of his Satanic Majesty. He told us how the idea of the Devil had been evolved out of the struggle of men with their own necessities, and how that idea had taken on different forms and characteristics, until the Devil of the nineteenth century is fitly represented by the Mephistopheles of Goethe's "Faust." All of this was quite interesting and instructive, but we are of the opinion that in it the lecturer "builded wiser than he knew." For, if what we have already said, concerning the fall of man, and his subsequent loss of all correct knowledge of the spiritual universe, be true, then we might reasonably expect precisely the state of things as described. With only a traditional knowledge of Satan, it is not strange that the various races of men should have personified their ideal Devil according to the circumstances of the different ages of the world. But all this proves the existence of a real, personal Devil, just as the same line of argument proves the existence of an uncreated God. Notice, we do not say that this proves the *necessity* of a Devil, as it does the necessity of a God, but only that it is the same line of argument which philosophers employ to reach the conclusion that there is a God. If, because the idea of a God

is generally diffused among mankind, it is inferred that such a being exists, the same argument ought to hold good in proving the existence of a Devil, since the idea of a Devil, in some form, is so prevalent in the world.

But let no one conclude from this that the existence of a God makes the existence of a Devil necessary. Because there is a sun that gives light, it does not follow that there *must be* another sun to give darkness. Because we find what Coleridge calls the "law of the opposites" in all departments of the physical world, we must be careful not to assume that the existence of any one thing absolutely requires the existence of its opposite, much less shall we hasten to the conclusion as to what that opposite certainly is. Those who claim that evil is only the opposite of good—a sort of negative thing like darkness—have surely a poor conception of the nature of evil. We think it has very *positive* qualities, and this is just why it is to be so much dreaded. And it is for the same reason that Satan, as the personal representative of evil, is capable of bringing such ruin on the human race.

The fact that different ages and different nations have given us different personifications of Satan, is no proof against his existence. The idea of a God has been subject to the same transformations. All this is partially explained by the considerations already presented in reference to man's losing the correct idea of spiritual beings. But in case of the Devil it is further explained by the fact that he has always manifested himself in whatever manner would best subserve his purposes. If he can deceive the people most readily by making them believe in almost every thing, as in the Middle Ages, when superstition reigned supreme, and when witchcraft was the *bête noire* of all good men, we may rest assured that this is precisely the way in which he will work. But if the revival of learning leads the minds of the people out of darkness into light, and breaks their faith in superstition, then it is the policy of the Devil to break their faith also in whatever is good and true. Hence, he appears just now most prominently in the skepticism of the age. And it is through the Rationalistic protest against faith, and the constant demand for scientific demonstration in every thing, that he expects at this time to lead the world "captive at his will." Surely, it is time we had come to understand this matter, and we are really thankful for

having our attention called to Mephistopheles as the Devil of the present century. We think this characterization will help us to more thoroughly prepare for the conflict that is now pending between skepticism and Christianity—a conflict which is becoming more and more intense around the very matters we are considering.

MEPHISTOPHELES AS SATAN.

We are inclined to think that the Mephistopheles of "Faust" is not far from the Bible representation of the Devil. Evidently, the *Diabolos* of the Bible is a being possessed of an overtowering intellect, without any heart; a head full of knowledge, without a particle of conscience; designing, crafty, and cunning, without any moral restraints to keep him from carrying out his most fiendish purposes.

Mephistopheles is not unlike this Bible Devil. And if *he* is Goethe's personification of modern skepticism, as is represented by some writers, then it is unquestionably true that the skepticism of this age may claim close kinship with the Satan of the Bible.

But just here it is time we should stop and inquire, Can we risk the conclusions of an investigation which ignores all heart and conscience? This is a question of very grave importance. If our modern scientists are to go on with remorseless energy in establishing simply an intellectual progress, then it is almost certain that Satan could not wish for more effective workers in his interests than are these same disturbers of the public faith. There can be no real conflict between true science and true religion. Hence, whenever men assume that learning is opposed to faith, that moment must they divorce intellect from heart, and knowledge from conscience. The result of this will give us the very skepticism represented by Mephistopheles, and this will soon bring us to a scientific millennium, where Satan will be king, and where all the finer and nobler instincts of humanity will be effectually and forever crushed.

Are we ready for this? Can we give our assent to such a termination of human struggle? Let us pause and reflect. With the advance of knowledge comes the danger we have intimated. Hence, it becomes all earnest men every-where to stand by the Word of God, and refuse to listen to any seductive voice that seeks to destroy faith in the Christian religion.

THE STRUGGLE AND THE VICTORY.

A few words in conclusion will suffice. We certainly take no pleasure in representing the side of the question we have in this paper, except so far as it is always a pleasure to represent the side of truth. The existence of Satan is unquestionably a reality, but it is a terrible reality. No one can take pleasure in the fact that he is constantly watched by an adversary, who "like a roaring lion, is walking about seeking whom he may devour." And yet, if such is the case, ignorance of the fact only the more exposes us to danger. Almost every day we meet a thousand disagreeable things, but we can not dispose of these by refusing to believe in their existence, or by treating them in a light and trivial manner. "Life is real, life is earnest," and in dealing with the unpleasant things with which we come in contact, we must not only be brave and earnest ourselves, but we must seek for heavenly wisdom to guide us into the only sure path of deliverance.

This brings us to consider what Divine mercy has done for us in order to give us the victory over the great enemy of our souls. While it is true that Satan has a real existence and a kingdom in this world, it is also true that our Lord Jesus Christ is able to deliver us from the power of Satan, and to keep us unto the everlasting kingdom. When Christ was here on the earth in the flesh, he met the Devil in a single contest, and most signally defeated him. But the Devil was only defeated, not conquered. Since then he has been striving to regain his lost prestige by renewed encounters, and to satisfy his revenge by deceiving, if possible, the very elect.

In this tremendous struggle we can not be idle spectators. Jesus says, "He that is not with me is against me; he that gathereth not with me scattereth abroad." Truly, has it been said: "Not a hairbreadth of unoccupied spiritual territory can be found in Christendom. The hostile tents of Christ and Satan come together, touch each other, all along the line. Not to receive the Savior is to reject him. Not to magnify him is to mock him. Not to serve him is to scourge him. Not to crown him with glory is to crown him with thorns. Not to enthrone him in our affections is to crucify him afresh with our hatred."

In this struggle between Christ and Satan, the victory for our king is already assured. Not only has Satan's career of triumph

been checked, but his influence is rapidly waning. Compared with eternity, he has but a moment more in which to reign, and revel, and riot, and run in the earth. Every prayer that goes up from pious hearts is a harbinger of his final defeat; and every Gospel sermon is a banner lifted up, on which is inscribed, "Glory to God in the highest; peace on earth, and good will among men."

And now, shall we hesitate as to which king we will serve? Shall we stand trembling and halting, when our glorious Conqueror is calling us to enter the contest that we may win the crown? Do we answer for the right? Do we determine for Christ? Then let every soldier of the cross adopt the language of the apostle and "be strong in the Lord, and in the power of his might. Put on the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to stand against the wiles of the Devil. For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places. Wherefore take unto you the whole armor of God, that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day, and having done all, to stand. Stand, therefore, having your loins girt about with truth, and having on the breastplate of righteousness; and your feet shod with the preparation of the Gospel of peace; above all, taking the shield of faith, wherewith ye shall be able to quench all the fiery darts of the wicked. And take the helmet of salvation, and the sword of the Spirit, which is the Word of God. Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints." And in this contest, may our Heavenly Father be with us, and give us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.

VII.—EVANGELISTS—THEIR OFFICE AND WORK.

OF all the officers in the Church of Christ, none is of more importance than the office of evangelist. It has received very little attention for many years, while the office of bishop has been the theme of many discourses, the subject of many books, and the cause of protracted discussions. Bishops and archbishops have figured largely in the history of religion and civilization, through many centuries, while evangelists have received very little attention; although, according to the teaching of the New Testament, the bishop's office is inferior to the office of evangelist. This will appear from the following facts:

1. Timothy was an evangelist. Paul told him to "do the work of an evangelist." (2 Tim. iv, 5.)

2. Particular instructions were given to this evangelist relative to the qualifications of a man who "desires the office of a bishop," and without which he could not be eligible. This is also true of Titus i, 7, 8, 9. Such instructions were never given to bishops relative to evangelists, because evangelists, as officers, are superior to bishops.

3. The ordination of bishops devolved on an evangelist; and was not to be done hastily by him. "Lay hands hastily on no man." (1 Tim. v, 22; Titus i, 5-9.)

4. Evangelists have authority to receive accusations against elders or bishops, and rebuke such as sin. "Against an elder receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses. Those who sin rebuke before all, that others also may fear." (1 Tim. v, 19, 20.) If any person should object to the application of this passage to bishops, as the apostle is speaking of elders, we remind such that elders and bishops are the same. To the proof of this we need only refer to Acts xx, 17, 28, where it is declared that Paul sent for the *elders* of the Church in Ephesus, and told them that the Holy Spirit had made them (*ἐπισκοποι*) *bishops*, or overseers.

5. That evangelists rank higher than bishops appears also from Eph. iv, 11. "And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers." The order in

which these officers are mentioned places the apostles highest. This is where Jesus places them. John xx, 21-23: "As the Father has sent me, I also send you. And having said this, he breathed on them, and says to them: Receive the Holy Spirit. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted to them; and whosoever ye retain, they are retained." That these words were spoken to the apostles is clear from the next sentence, "But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Didymus, was not with them when Jesus came." To no other persons was the power given to remit and retain sins. To these men it was said, "He who (δέχομαι) accepts you, accepts me; and he who accepts me, accepts him that sent me." No other class of men are placed so high in authority; and no provision is made for successors. The apostolic authority is now found only in the recorded teaching.

Next in order and dignity are prophets. These were a class of officials superior to evangelists and inferior to apostles, and therefore, in the order in which they are mentioned in Eph. iv, 11, they are placed before evangelists, and after apostles. The evangelists are ranked next below the inspired prophets, and next above pastors and teachers. A pastor is one who tends or feeds a flock; and bishops are identified with pastors, in Acts xx, 28: "Take heed therefore to yourselves, and to all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit has made you overseers [bishops], to feed the Church of the Lord, which he purchased with his own blood." Bishops being required to take care of the flock, and that being the business of pastors, it is evident that both these names of office apply to the same rank. Hence, if an evangelist is officially superior to a pastor, he is also superior to a bishop. How improper, therefore, for bishops to assume authority not only over a number of Churches, but also over evangelists, who by the authority of the New Testament, are made their superiors! There is no such order of men as Episcopal bishops recognized by the Holy Scriptures. The New Testament bishops are quite a different order.

WHAT IS AN EVANGELIST?

An evangelist is, etymologically, one who brings good news. But the word is used in a more extended sense in the New Testament. Hence, Paul said to Timothy (2d Epist. iv, 5), "But be thou watchful in all things; endure hardships, do the work of an evangelist, fully accomplish thy ministry." This evangelist had a "work"

to do, and a ministry to accomplish, which required watchfulness, and the endurance of hardship.

WHAT IS THE WORK OF AN EVANGELIST?

The first thing for an evangelist to do is to "remember Jesus Christ." This divine being must be kept up in the mind, above all things. He must be remembered, also, as "raised from the dead," and as "of the seed of David." When Paul went into Macedonia he besought Timothy to remain still in Ephesus, to charge certain persons to teach no other doctrine than that which concerned Christ—to pay no attention to fables and endless genealogies. These fables are called "Jewish fables," in Titus i, 14. No people were more fond of establishing a good reputation by references to a respectable ancestry. Their motto was, "We have Abraham for a father." It was an important part of the work of an evangelist to teach these people that they must renounce the fables, and adhere to the truth in Christ; that they must not depend on the faith and virtue of their ancestry, but remember that "the end of the commandment is love, out of a pure heart, and a good conscience, and unfeigned faith." The evangelist must insist on a pure heart, a good conscience, and real, not feigned, faith.

Further, as a part of the work of the evangelist, Timothy was required to see "that supplications, prayers, intercessions, thanksgivings, be made for all men; for kings, and all who are in authority;" and, in doing this, "that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing;" and, "in like manner, also, that the women, in becoming apparel, adorn themselves with modesty and sobriety; not in braided hair, or gold, or pearls, or costly raiment; but, which becomes women professing piety, by means of good works." As a part of "the work of an evangelist," he was required to see that "the women learn in silence, with all subjection;" and not to "permit the woman to teach, nor to have authority over the man, but to be in silence."

For the regulation of Churches, and their proper government, the evangelist must look well to "any one" who "desires the office of bishop," and see that he "be blameless, the husband of one wife, sober, discreet, orderly, hospitable, apt in teaching; not given to wine, not a striker, but forbearing, averse to strife, not a lover of

money; presiding well over his own house, having his children in subjection with all decorum; not a novice, lest being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the Devil;" and also that he has "a good testimony from those without, lest he fall into the reproach, and the snare of the Devil."

The proper business of an evangelist requires him to see that the following law is observed relative to the (*διακονοι*) ministers: "Ministers, in like manner, must be grave, not double-tongued, not given to much wine, not greedy of gain; holding the mystery of the faith in a pure conscience. And let these also first be proved; then let them (*διακονειτωσαν*) perform service, being without reproach. [Their] wives, in like manner, must be grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things. Let the ministers be husbands of one wife, presiding well over their children and their own houses. For those who have performed service well obtain for themselves a good rank, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus."

That attention to all these things entered into the work of an evangelist is evident from the next sentence of the apostle: "These things I write to thee, hoping to come to thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to conduct thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God, a pillar and basis of the truth."

The apostles foretold "that in after times some will depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and teachings of demons; of those who speak lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron; forbidding to marry, commanding to abstain from food, which God created to be received with thanksgiving, for those who believe and know the truth." As indicative of "the work of an evangelist in relation to these things, he says: "If thou suggest these things to the brethren thou shalt be a good minister to Christ Jesus." It is also made a part of the "work of an evangelist" to see that proper provision be made for widows, and that those who should be supported by the Church receive the necessary supplies.

It is the duty of the evangelist also to see that the "elders who preside well, be counted worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the Word and teaching." When two or three witnesses sustain an accusation against an elder, the evangelist was required to receive such accusation; and if it appeared, on investigation, that

the elder had sinned, to rebuke him before all, that the rest might also fear. In view of the importance and solemnity of all these things, Paul says to the evangelist: "I charge thee before God, and Jesus Christ, and the elder angels, that thou observe these things without prejudging, doing nothing with partiality."

It was also part of "the work of an evangelist" to teach masters and servants to observe their relative duties, all of which are clearly stated in Paul's first letter to Timothy. These things he was to teach and exhort. "The work of an evangelist" extended also to the instruction of the rich. "Charge those who are rich in this world, that they be not high-minded, nor place their hope on the uncertainty of riches, but in God, who gives us all things richly for enjoyment; that they do good, be rich in good works, be free in imparting, willing to communicate, laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on the true life."

To insure the faithful performance of "the work of an evangelist," Paul says, "I charge thee in the sight of God, who preserves all alive, and of Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed the good profession, that thou keep the commandment without spot, blameless, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ," etc. And again, "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane babblings, and opposition to that which is falsely called knowledge; which some professing erred concerning the faith."

Another part of "the work of an evangelist" is clearly expressed in these words: "And the things which thou heardest from me by many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men who will be able to teach others also." Herein provision is made for the perpetuity of the office of evangelist.

As a kind of summary of evangelical work, Paul says (1 Tim. iv, 1), in the form of another solemn charge: "I charge thee before God, and Christ Jesus, who will judge the living and the dead, and by his appearing and his kingdom, preach the Word; apply thyself in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and teaching." Such is his last "charge" to his very dear son Timothy. Then follows his last exhortation; "But be thou watchful in all things, endure hardship, do the work of an evangelist, fully accomplish thy ministry." To understand more fully the work of an evangelist, read carefully the two letters to Timothy and the one to Titus.

VIII.—THE GREAT MISTAKE OF OUR TIMES.

TO say that we err, is only to say that we are human. To affirm that we do not err, is to affirm that we are divine. All men err, for all men are human. General Councils may affirm, either qualifiedly or unqualifiedly, that the Pope of Rome is infallible; but this affirmation may not be true, unless it can be shown that a General Council is infallible. To affirm the infallibility of such a Council is to affirm the infallibility of the members of said Council. In that case, the Pope differs not from the members of the Council. They are alike infallible. And if the Council compliment the Pope by saying that he is infallible, courtesy demands that he shall reciprocate by telling the members that they are equally so. To put the Pope's infallibility beyond all doubt, it must be shown that those who are the witnesses by whom he is proved to be so, are infallible witnesses.

But the Pope, the bishops, and the Roman priesthood, are not the only fallible religious teachers who claim to be disciples of Jesus. We Protestants hold and teach many errors. This is clear from our disagreements among ourselves. In every disagreement there must be at least one error. Both parties can not be correct; but both may be wrong. It depends on what is affirmed, and what the counter-affirmation is.

The Protestants have made many very great mistakes, both in doctrine and practice. In both they disagree. This disagreement has led to the organization of different denominations; and has led to rivalries, contentions, and a vast expenditure of both time and funds which should have been appropriated to the conversion of men. The time and money have both been wasted. For this waste they are accountable to God, who will judge every man according to his works, whether good or evil. This denominationalism is not an innocent matter, as many suppose; much less is it useful, and therefore commendable, as some others teach. It is hostile to the law of unity, so frequently enjoined in the New Testament, and which is summarily expressed in these anti-denominational words: "*Let there be no divisions among you.*" Every effort to build up either of the

denominations is a positive and open violation of this law of God, for which there can be no adequate apology; and such effort must finally meet its due reward. That Jesus Christ is the Messiah and the Son of God, is the true doctrine, and to be taught to the exclusion of all the *isms* of our day; and that "there is ONE BODY and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, and one baptism,"—is to be taught in opposition to all "the various denominations" of the age in which we live. The most pious ministers and godly men and women, in all denominations, see and regret our divided condition.

There are those who are as partisan in religion as any men are in politics; and it is as hard for them to be real disciples of Jesus as it is for a mere political partisan to be a philanthropist. And remaining such, when the former can be a disciple and the latter a philanthropist, a full-grown camel can pass through a needle without touching either side. It is neither the love of God nor the love of man that makes the religious partisan active in Church matters; but the love of his "denomination." He blindly mistakes his zeal for *his* Church, for zeal for God; and his little partisan creed, *made for him* in Protestant, not apostolic, times, is as infallible with him as is the Pope with the Papist. Of all the dwarfs on the Lord's footstool, the mere religious partisan is the smallest and the most deformed. Were this a necessity, he should be pitied; but as it is voluntary, he is to be despised, if it be lawful to despise any man.

If they could all be abstracted from all the denominations, and be organized into one Church universal, what a Church that would be! It would deserve to be clothed in garments baptized in blood, and presented with a sword for the right hand, and a torch for the left, with a bundle of fagots for the back, that it might appear as terrible as an army with banners, and go on its way rejoicing, from conquering unto conquering, and crying, Woe to the world because of offending *us*. One woe is past; and behold, two more woes are coming hereafter! On its communion table should be placed, for bread, the mangled bodies of Dissenters; for wine, a cup of red fluid, to indicate "the blood of saints and prophets," and to suggest its regular succession from those who shed the blood of those worthies. Christians never persecuted; partisans have often done it—not Catholics only, but Protestants also.

The great mistake of this age consists in building up denominations, and denominational institutions, such as schools, colleges, missionary societies, and Sunday-schools, *all with charters placing them under perpetual denominational control*. All denominational real estate, and other property in legacies, is held in this way; and this is one of the chief obstacles to a return to apostolic unity. To retain such property, the "denomination" must be preserved, and their names must remain as they are, unless some law can be made which will allow a change of names and a retention of property, in such cases.

Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodist Episcopalians, Congregationalists, etc., might all abandon sprinkling and adopt immersion—the "one baptism" of the New Testament—without any violation of their charters, because all these Churches, from their origin, admitted immersion to be baptism. This done, then there would be unity in this "one baptism." They now all believe Jesus to be "Lord of all." In this there is "one faith" and "one Lord." They all believe that the Father of our Lord is the only God and Father. Here is the "one God and Father." But how are we to have the "one body," if we continue the denominations? The principle laid down by the apostle is not only "one Lord, one faith, and one baptism," but also *one body* and one spirit."

Can any one suppose that the "one body" of which Paul spoke was made up of the various denominations now existing among us? If it was not, and were it possible out of such *conflicting plurality* to form a *unity*, it still would not be the "one body" of which he spoke, and therefore it would not be the body of which Christ is the Head. The plain truth is that the unity of Christ's body (the Church) is utterly incompatible with denominationalism. The truth in this case can not be disguised, and will not be disputed.

Not one of the denominations, from the Papacy to the most insignificant sect, was known, or had any existence, till long after the death of the last of the twelve apostles. Their very names are proof of what we here affirm, not one of which can be found in the New Testament times, nor for centuries thereafter. Who, that has read that volume attentively, and subsequent Church history, will dispute this fact? The whole system of denominationalism is wrong, and only wrong, and that continually. The competition between the denominations is not profitable, nor even respectable among thinking

men and women. This strife converts no one to Christ, but to a party, or parties, and only increases the difficulties in the way of unity. The more these denominations are strengthened, the farther are we from the "one body and one spirit." It is a pity that another person should ever unite with any of them. Better that all outside of them should continue outside, but study the Scriptures, believe the Gospel, repent of their sins, "be baptized for the remission of sins," and "patiently continue in well-doing, seeking for glory and honor and immortality," entirely independent of all these organizations, than that they should strengthen the existing divisions. It is better to serve God alone than to oppose him in company, however great that company may be.

There are many who claim to be undenominational, and who at the same time would not consent to hire a minister of another denomination, simply because he would not preach their denominational views. To preach that Jesus "is the Christ, the Son of the living God;" that "God raised him from the dead," "and gave him to be head over all things to the Church," and made him "Lord of all;" to require "all men every-where" to "repent and be baptized, calling upon his name for remission of sins," and "steadfastly continue in the apostle's teaching, in the fellowship, the breaking of bread, and their prayers," is not enough for "the denominations." A minister must know something besides "Jesus Christ and him crucified" to be employed by them as a pastor. And yet they say that they are in favor of unity, and opposed to denominationalism or sectarianism!

The best way to effect a unity among Christians is for ministers of the different denominations to exchange pulpits for at least one whole year, by the hearty consent of their respective Churches, and then preach and practice as the apostles did, ignoring, entirely, all speculative theology and all metaphysical doctrine, as unnecessary to acceptance with God and fellowship with his people. They and the Churches would understand one another much better for the change, and learn to love each other more.

The doctrine of *our* Church and *your* Church, in the sense in which these phrases are now used, had no existence in apostolic times, if such expressions were then used at all, of which there is no evidence, even in relation to locality.

Those who are anxious to return to apostolic unity would do well

to ascertain what changes can be made, under the laws of their respective States, relative to an abandonment of denominationalism without alienating church property of all kinds, and what changes in the laws which are deficient in relation to this object can be made. Save all that can be saved in this way, and lose all that can not be so saved. It is better to lose all our church property, and become a unit, than to retain it and remain divided, in direct and open violation of the law of God. Much property is not very favorable to the salvation of men, nor of Churches, if Jesus is to be regarded as authority in this case, as in all others. He made the entrance of a rich man into the kingdom of heaven as difficult as the passage of a camel through the eye of a needle. The one was as morally impossible, *with man*, as the other was physically impossible. *God alone* could induce the rich to so use their property as to be received into everlasting habitations; and if respect for him will not induce the members of the denominations to use or even lose their property rather than violate his divine law of unity, they love mammon more than they love God.

There are those who are even proud of *their* Church, which is not so much as once mentioned in all God's Word! They glory even in the unscriptural *name* of their denomination. This is a great mistake, and not a small sin. They also glory in the wealth of their Church, and also in the personal wealth of their membership. The poor man, who had not where to lay his head, if he concealed his Divine Majesty and only showed his piety and humanity, would not be esteemed as rich members are, although he was once rich, and became poor, that we, through his poverty, might become rich.

Our schools, *our* seminaries, *our* colleges, *our* house of worship, *our* Sunday-school, and *our* missionary societies, and, in fact, *our* every thing which is denominational, is always emphatic with many religious partisans. They love these things because they are *theirs*, and not because they are Scriptural. This sect-building, sect-pride, and sect-glorification, are the Phariseism, the mistake, and the sin of our age, as they have been of some ages gone by.

If all professors of the faith of Christ could be reclaimed from denominationalism, or, which is the same thing, party-ism; and if they could abandon their unscriptural names, and preach and teach the Gospel of the grace of God, as did the apostles, and practice all that

they commanded, and still retain all the property now held by the various Churches, they would constitute a power irresistible; and the amount of good which they, by earnest co-operation, would accomplish in one year, would surpass the last fifty years' successes of their divided and antagonistic efforts.

It is pleasant to know that professed Christians are beginning to talk in earnest of unity among the disciples of Jesus. All, or at least very many, feel its importance. They think of it, they talk of it, and they pray for it. But they must also work for it; and every man must do his own work. He must cease to be a party man, and become a kind, and even affectionate, Christian. He must willingly abandon all the commandments of men, and do and teach what the Scriptures teach and enjoin.

The Church was a grand institution in the beginning. Jesus founded it on the rock of eternal truth: "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God.*" But he never founded the various denominations on their various and conflicting creeds. "The Lord added the saved to the Church," but he never added any to the denominations. Paul and Barnabas "appointed for them elders in the Church;" but not one in every denomination. Paul taught "every-where in every Church;" but he never taught anywhere in any of our denominations. "Christ loved the Church, and gave himself up for it, that he might sanctify it, having cleansed it by the bathing of water in the Word." But he never loved, gave himself up for, cleansed, nor bathed, the denominations in water, either in the Word or out of it. He never founded them nor acknowledged them. But his law, "Let there be no divisions among you," is "a perpetual injunction" against their formation and support. Christ "is the head of the body, the Church;" but he is not the head of the denominations. He added believers to the Church; but he never added any denomination to it. The practice of speaking of all these denominations as the Church of Christ is little less than an insult to him who founded it. The Church of Christ, made up of conflicting denominations! How unscriptural and absurd the thought!

What remains to be done, then, in order to obey the law of Jesus, "*Let there be no divisions among you,*" is to abandon all sectarian names, and dissolve all sectarian organizations, and to organize as a Church of Christ, and assume that name; to annul every institution,

and abandon every observance, not clearly taught in the New Testament, and to commence at the beginning of that book, and study it with prayer, attention, and earnestness, for the purpose of ascertaining what John, Jesus, and the apostles taught and enjoined; and continue in this way through the whole volume, and review every two months, or more frequently; to converse freely and kindly with all who confess the Lord Jesus, and feel that we have only "one God and Father," "one Lord" Jesus, "one faith," "one baptism," "one hope of our calling," and "one body and one spirit." There should be no more "denominations" now than in primitive times.

Every modification of skepticism and unbelief, from the mere doubter to the bald-faced atheist, is tending to organization and unity, for the purpose of opposing, more successfully, the claims of the great "Teacher come from God," whose code of morals is too pure for the depraved passions of man. These opponents of our cause understand that "union is strength," as did our Lord when he prayed for those who believed on him, that all of them might "be one," as he and his Father were "one," that the world might believe that the Father sent him. Down with all denominational banners, and unfurl the flag of Jesus, "the King of kings and the Lord of lords." "Let there be no divisions among you," but become "complete, in the same mind and the same judgment," that ye may "all speak the same thing." Such is the law, and such the testimony.

"May the kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you. Amen."

IX.—IS THE REFORMATION COMPLETE?

THE history of the past religious reformation teaches us that no reformation ever progressed until the work of reformation was complete. What, we inquire, is to be the history of the one in which we are now engaged? If we consider attentively the character of the preceding reformation, we shall find that they were not deliberately planned, but that they were originated and perpetuated rather by the force of circumstances than by concerted action upon the part of the reformers. It will also be apparent that the results were never anticipated; more was accomplished than was contemplated, and in a manner entirely unexpected. It seems, however, that those engaged in the work of reformation have generally fallen into the error of supposing the work finished before a good beginning had been made. The consequence of this error was, that those who had been clamorous in the outset for reformation wrapped themselves in their orthodoxy, and frowned upon any attempt from others to advance beyond the circle explored by themselves. Nor is this true of religious reform only; the same feature is manifest in all the advancements of science. For instance, one who has been the originator of a new theory in medical science is about the first to raise the cry of "Innovation," when something is proposed which did not originate in his mind.

In confirmation of these views, let us look at the reformation of the sixteenth century. Can any one believe that, when Martin Luther, at Wittenberg, attacked the sale of indulgences, he had the least idea that, in a few years afterward, he would renounce monastic life; or that he would reduce the number of sacraments from seven to two? It may safely be conjectured that he never expected to discard the half of the papistical errors which he ultimately denounced. That things accomplished by him were not the result of preconcerted action is very evident to any one at all familiar with the history of his reformation. And what is the judgment of succeeding generations as to the completeness of his work? Grand and glorious as it was, all Protestants will concede that he left much undone.

The Lutherans, who take their name from the renowned reformer, and who are reputed to be nearer in doctrine to the Catholic Church than other Protestants, confess that the work was not complete. They have canonized the Epistle of James, which Luther rejected because of its supposed conflict with the Epistles of Paul, on the subject of justification by faith. They have also canonized the Book of Revelation, which Luther rejected. They have so modified their views on "transubstantiation" as to virtually repudiate the doctrine, while Luther believed it to the end of his life. In many of the minor particulars, they have decided that the great reformer ceased reforming too soon.

But the rise and progress of Methodism has by some been called a reformation. It was indeed one in regard to the practice of Christianity, and several changes in doctrine also attended the movement. This, however, soon run its course, attended by like unexpected results, and impelled by circumstances more than by the design of those who took prominent part in it, and Methodism has long since ceased to be regarded as a present reformatory institution.

This brings us to the reformation of this, the nineteenth century, a reformation that was inaugurated, in the Eastern part of the United States, by Thomas Campbell and his son Alexander; and, about the same time, by Barton Stone and Walter Scott, in Kentucky. The opponents of this reformation have deridingly called it "The 'Current' Reformation," an appellation which the Disciples thankfully accept, and which they trust will be appropriate so long as need for reformation exists.

Now, in order to come to a conclusion as to the probable fate of this reformation, it may be well to compare it with preceding reformations, and especially with the chief one, that of the sixteenth century. Immediately on doing so we notice some important differences. In the first place, we are impressed with this striking difference between this and other reformations: this one was not set on foot for the purpose of correcting some one error in doctrine, but all errors in the Church, whether of doctrine or practice. There was, then, a definite object in view, or end proposed. It was simply the uprooting and casting out of all humanisms from the Church, and a complete return to the teaching and practice of apostolic times, so far as it could be done. Nor was this war entered into without reckoning

the hosts and counting the costs. Calmly did the great minds that conceived the grand idea of a perfect reformation survey the field before them. Believing that truth, with its ten thousand, was able to meet and vanquish error, with its twenty thousand, they decided to risk a conflict. Every unprejudiced mind must confess the ground was well chosen and the position wisely selected. They decided to ignore all tradition in religious matters, and to plant themselves upon the Word of God, and, with the Book as its own commentary, seek to exhume the truth that lay covered with the dust of the apostasy. It is conceded, even by opponents of the reformation, that they started right. With no faith in the superstitious adage "that a good beginning has a bad ending," we thank God that they began right. They have made some progress. In point of adherents, from a score, in less than half a century they have increased to half a million, in the United States. In addition to those who, from almost every religious organization, and from the world, have openly espoused the cause of the reformation, there are thousands, yet attached to the various religious organizations of the present day, whose hearts are beating in sympathy with the great work in which we are engaged. Indeed, wherever the principles of the reformation have been fully proclaimed for any length of time, the most marked modifications have taken place in the preaching and practice of Protestant Churches.

But there is a light in which we wish to regard our progress that bears directly upon the subject in hand. We would inquire for the doctrinal points that have been established. When we say established, we mean concurred in by the reformers, yet we trust with that openness of mind to conviction that will permit us to dissent; if it can be shown that they are not sustained by the teachings of the Bible. Of these points we may mention: first, this, that the Gospel offers salvation to the whole human family; secondly, that the Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, including the idea that no supernatural direct agency of the Holy Spirit is necessary to conversion; thirdly, that faith in Christ, renunciation of sin in heart and life, and immersion in the name of Christ, are the conditions of pardon to the sinner; again, in the fourth place, that all those who have thus been pardoned are qualified to wear the name of Christians, and that any other than this, or some Scriptural appellation, can not be assumed without dishonor to Christ; fifthly,

that Christians should observe the first day of the week in token of the resurrection of Christ, and upon that day show his death in keeping the Supper; and, lastly, that the New Testament furnishes us with all the instruction necessary for leading the Christian life, and governing Christians, when organized into a Church or congregation.

We end our catalogue here, lest we get on disputed ground. These, we think, may be regarded as settled points, to which, perhaps, others might be added. Now, we can imagine some good brother saying, "Why, there are several other cardinal points peculiar to the reformation that are settled, though there may be some disposition to open them for discussion." To that very point our question and its discussion tend. If, now, we regard all the positions assumed, or rather contended for, by the pioneers of the present reformation, as Scriptural, to be so settled that we can not discuss them; indeed, if we regard any of those named above as settled beyond the privilege of discussing them, then, in one feature at least, the reformation is complete. Its wheels have truly fallen into the ruts of orthodoxy, from which they can not be extricated. But what of the vast mine of truth to be explored? Have we raised and discussed all the issues that are to be drawn from the sacred oracles by a careful study of them? Are there no jewels of truth lying now obscured by the dust of tradition? If we decide that not only are the questions that have been discussed finally settled, but that, in addition to this, no more truth is to be found, then, indeed, is the reformation a failure, not in the sense in which our foes predict; for, indeed, its advocates will exist, a numerous and increasing people, but it will fail to accomplish its mission. If, when any thing new is proposed as a Scriptural doctrine, we refuse to "prove all things and hold fast that which is good," and raise the cry of "Innovation," "Heresy," what then? A few years of leaven-working will roll away, and then a Luther, a Campbell, or a Stone will rise, and with oratorical thunder shake our religious heavens till we shall have another reformation. More than this. The Church, which we are aiming to gather out of Babylon, and from the four quarters of the earth, will have then become a party. Its creed could then be written in full, as we have recorded a part. We could no longer claim the whole Bible for our creed, but only so much as we had decided was necessary to be believed.

How, now, shall we answer the question, "Is the reformation complete?" For our own part we would answer in the negative. Though we see many signs of a tendency to go the way of preceding reformations, still we indulge the hope that there is, in the great body of those contending for the faith once delivered to the saints, a spirit of free inquiry that will enable us to prosecute the work till we shall come, once more, "in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ."

If we are called upon to state in what respects the reformation is not yet complete, we may not be able to enumerate with exactness the particular points. But this does not necessarily affect our conclusion. It is against the doctrine of crystallization that we are entering our protest. We think we see several grand results which ought to come out of the present reformation, which have not yet been reached. But our main purpose, in this article, is not so much to call attention to these as to the danger we are in of making a fixed, unalterable creed, out of results already attained. Let us seek to know all we possibly can, and let us reverently accept of the truth as we see it in the light of each day, but let us leave all human deductions open to revision.

LITERARY NOTICES.

HOME LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Early History of the Disciples.* By A. S. HAYDEN. Cincinnati: Chase & Hall. 12mo. pp. 466. 1875.

WE presume that few, if any, discoverers of great facts or truths have even a remote idea of the results that are to follow. Who can suppose that Watt had the faintest conception of what a revolution would be produced by his discovery of steam as a motive power. But it was easier to foresee results in this case than in the case of those who have discovered some great truth in religion and announced it to the world. It is easier to foresee the effect of physical causes than of moral causes.

When Luther began his reformation in Germany, it is doubtful whether the thought ever entered his mind that his movement would be carried to such an extent as it has been. But his movement struck a vital point in the affairs of men. It touched a popular chord; and a force of this kind, once started, can not be stopped again very easily. Luther's movement was an effort to free the soul from the bondage of priestcraft, to endow individuals with the prerogatives which Christ had vouchsafed to them, to give every man the right to exercise his own conscience in every thing that pertains to his religious life. This was a new revelation to men at the time it was made. Not that it was new in fact, for Christ had taught this doctrine fourteen hundred years before. But it was new to the age in which Luther lived; for Christ's grand truths had been overshadowed by the superstitions and corruptions of the Church of Rome for so long a time that the people had lost sight of his teachings. Luther's announcement was like the breaking of light from the sun through the clouds of a dark day; it was the promise of manhood, of individual power, of the dawn of a new era, when freedom of thought, freedom of speech, and the right of individual interpretation, should be the inheritance of every man, whatever else might be his condition.

This was the beginning of a return from an apostasy to primitive Christianity. It did not entirely reach the point aimed at, but it prepared the way for a complete restoration of the Gospel as it was preached by the

apostles of Jesus Christ. It gave the endowment for individual manhood, and this was the first step out of that religious despotism which held all men in bondage to the edicts of the Pope.

Following this reformation for a time, it is easy to mark the places where it began to lose its force, and where another impulse was necessary to keep up the movement in the direction it was started. Hence, new leaders were necessary, and these came as rapidly as they were needed. Calvin, Wesley, and others did much to help on the work; but, at the end of the eighteenth century, another dead point had been reached, and little or nothing was being accomplished for the overthrow of Popery, and the conversion of the world. Protestantism had developed a number of rival sects, each warring against the others, and all interested mainly in their own preservation, and having little care or concern for the great purpose which had inspired Luther and his co-laborers in breaking away from the Roman Church and lifting up the standard of freedom for the individual conscience.

It was at a time like this that the Campbells issued their "Declaration and Address," in which they reviewed the religious situation, and announced the principles by which they would be guided in their effort to restore apostolic Christianity in faith and practice. From that time till the present, these principles have been at work. And now, as we look back over the conquests that have been made, we conclude that the framers of the "Declaration and Address," issued in 1809, could not have anticipated, even in their dreams, the mighty results that have followed. Already a body of people, numbering five or six hundred thousand in the United States alone, have adopted the Bible and the Bible alone, as their rule of faith and practice, and refuse to accept any human authority as final in settling religious questions. They make their appeal to the Word of God. "Where it speaks, they speak: where it is silent, they are silent." Nor is this the entire result of the movement. The whole of religious society has been sensibly affected by the earnest advocacy which the Disciples have made for a complete return to apostolic Christianity. The union sentiment which has been so rapidly growing within the last twenty years is, to a large extent, the result of the religious movement started by the Campbells and their co-laborers. Human creeds are no longer formidable impediments in the way of religious fraternity. While they yet remain, they have, to a large extent, lost their hold on the popular mind. It was against these, as bonds of religious union and communion, that the Disciples made one of their most determined attacks; and it must certainly be gratifying to them to notice that their efforts have not been without success. We might point to many other facts to illustrate the success of this religious movement, but what we have said will be quite sufficient to introduce the book whose title is at the head of this notice.

If what we have said concerning the religious movement of the Disciples be half true, surely the history of the men who have been mainly instrumental in introducing it, and bringing it prominently before the people, can not be otherwise than interesting and instructive. And it is this fact that gives Mr. Hayden's book its principal significance. While he confines himself for the most part to the advocates of this movement in the Western Reserve, Ohio, his book is not the less important on that account. It is only by such local histories that we can have brought before us the men who deserve to be mentioned as the pioneers of the movement.

Mr. Hayden's fitness for the work of writing the early history of the Disciples in the Western Reserve will scarcely be questioned by any one who is acquainted with him. Associated himself with the men and work of which he writes, from the beginning, and personally acquainted with nearly all the actors in the history, possessing a judicial but sympathetic mind, and a conscience that would exclude every thing but the truth, it is not remarkable that we should have a book worthy of the subject of which it treats, and one that is likely to be regarded as an important historical contribution to the greatest religious movement of modern times.

While the work is local in some respects, it will be found that this feature does not materially damage its interests for the general reader. Times and places are used only for the convenience of the writer in bringing forward certain men to illustrate the origin and development of the movement itself. Evidently, his main purpose was to tell the rise and progress of those principles which have for their object the restoration of primitive Christianity, and it is this fact that is the chief value of the work. While it is right and proper that the names of the actors should be rescued from oblivion, it is altogether more important that the work which they accomplished should be properly brought before the world. Hence, while the book will be interesting to a large number of people for special reasons, it will also be interesting to all students of religious history, and especially to those who wish to understand the movement of which it treats. We heartily commend it to all such, as a trustworthy statement and defense of New Testament Christianity, as understood and advocated by the Disciples of Christ.

2.—*Bible Lands*. By the Rev. HENRY J. VAN LENNEP, D. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 8vo. pp. 132. 1875.

RECENT archæological investigations have awakened a new interest in all that relates to Bible lands, and especially in the manners and customs of the people. Old relics that have been buried beneath the centuries have brought to light many things concerning the ancients, but these can not be interpreted and understood so well in any other way as in the light of the

manners and customs of the people of the present time. For, however different the people of the present may be in some respects from what they were in the time of the Savior, a knowledge of the people of to-day will greatly help us in understanding many things that belong to the periods when the Bible was written. Hence the value of such a work as we have now before us. In fact, it will be found that the habits of Eastern people have undergone very little change. Stanley has truly said: "The unchanged habits of the East render it a kind of living Pompeii. The outward appearances, which, in the case of the Greeks and Romans, we know only through art and writing, the marble, fresco, and parchment, in the case of the Jewish history we know through the forms of actual men, living and moving before us, wearing almost the same garb, speaking in almost the same language, and certainly with the same general utterance of speech and tone and manners." And if such be the case, it will readily appear that the subjects discussed in this volume are of very great importance to the Biblical student. He is at once brought into familiar contact with living representatives of Bible times, and is thereby enabled to understand more fully than he could otherwise do, many of the most important things in the Word of God.

Doubtless, the Biblical student has often felt the need of just such a work as this, and we think it can not fail to command very general attention, as well as contribute largely to some important branches of Biblical criticism.

There is very little in the volume that is specially new. It is, for the most part, a compilation from various sources, but, as a whole, it is so well done that we feel really thankful to the author for the labor which he has evidently bestowed upon it.

Not the least important part of the work are the illustrations. These are numerous, and are often of very great value in helping us to form correct conceptions of the various things treated of.

Many of the chapters discuss subjects of the very greatest interest, such as "The Tent, and Nomad Life," "Permanent Habitations," "The Furniture of the House," "The Inmates of the House." But the two chapters which have interested us most are those on "Life in the Family," and "Social Life."

The following introduction to the chapter on "Social Life" will give the reader a taste of the quality of the book:

"Orientals possess an eminently social disposition. No distinctions of rank or fortune are ever allowed to interfere with the gratification of this taste, although no people on earth are more particular in observing the conventional forms which govern social life. It is difficult to conceive that from among a people so thoroughly social there should have arisen, during the earlier centuries of our era, the numerous mute hermits described by history, whose solitary cells, caves, and pillars still attest the truth of its statements. But

the warmth of the Oriental temperament, and the depth of its religious convictions, sufficiently account for the apparent contradiction. This social peculiarity is the mainspring of that hospitality which has ever characterized the East. It is not a land of books, nor of newspapers; the living voice is the only medium of information, and he who happens to have laid up a store of the latter is sure to be feasted until he has exhausted his stock. The people are inquisitive, quick of apprehension, and fond of knowledge of any kind; and, when the long evenings come, the man who can best entertain the company by the flickering light of the lamp-fire, or of the pine chips wedged in a crack of the wall, or in the rich man's hall, where the guests recline upon the cushioned divan, and the apartment is lighted by the tall candlestick set in the midst, that man becomes the center of the group, and is regaled with the best pipe and the choicest coffee. Hospitality has thus grown to be an important institution, practiced as a matter of course. The host of to-day ever expects to be himself a guest to-morrow. There are no hotels; the caravansary, as its name sufficiently denotes, is a house (*sarai*) intended for the accommodation of the passing caravan, composed of merchants traveling with their merchandise, who could not conveniently be accommodated in private houses. The solitary traveler, or the small company who journey on business, unencumbered by baggage, stop at the Arab's tent, or alight at the 'guest chamber' (page 442) of the mountain village, and sit down at the unaltered board of the sheik, or *kidhaya*. Thus did Abraham entertain 'angels unawares.' (Heb. xiii, 2.) So it was with Nehemiah, who, while he governed the returned captives of Israel without taxation, lest they be overburdened, yet practiced an almost regal hospitality, daily entertaining at his table 'a hundred and fifty of the Jews and rulers, besides those that came unto him from among the heathen that were about;' so that the provision daily consumed in his household consisted of 'one ox and six choice sheep, also fowls,'—and, once in ten days, 'store of all sorts of wine.' (Neh. v, 17.) And the Hebrew legislator deemed the practice of hospitality of so great importance that he frequently enjoined it upon his people to 'love the stranger,' reminding them that they themselves had been strangers in the land of Egypt. (Ex. xxii, 21; xxiii, 9; Deut. x, 19.)

"In performing the duties of hospitality to a traveler or visitor, be he a stranger or a friend, the host receives him in his best room or in his divan, if the weather be mild. The reception-room becomes his apartment for the time being. Here his friends call upon him, and here he transacts his business; here, also, he takes his meals, his host himself waiting upon him, if he desires to show him special respect (Gen. xviii, 8); and here he sleeps at night, upon bedding kept for the purpose in a closet of the same room. Before his arrival a messenger announces his approach to the master of the house, who hastens to his gate, holds the bridle and stirrup, and helps him to dismount. If they are old friends, or of rank nearly equal, they embrace, each placing his right hand upon the other's left shoulder, and kissing him on the right cheek, then putting the left hand on the other's right shoulder, kissing him on the left cheek. (Luke vii, 45; xv, 20. Perkins, p. 69.) It is thus that treacherous Joab embraced Amasa, and, instead of placing his right hand upon his shoulder, seized him by the beard and stabbed him "with the sword in his left," "in the fifth rib." (2 Sam. xx, 9, 10.) And thus did Judas Iscariot kiss our Lord. (Matt. xxvi, 49.)

"The salaam is now exchanged: 'Peace be unto thee.' Answer: 'And unto thee be peace.' (1 Sam. xxv, 6; Luke xxiv, 36, etc.) And if the visitor be of a higher rank than his host, the latter kisses him not, but 'bows down to the earth' when he salutes him, touching the ground with his hand, which he then brings to his lips and his head. (Gen. xviii, 2; 1 Sam. xxiv, 8.) This mode of salutation existed both in Persia and Egypt, being pictured upon the monuments, as may be seen in the accompanying illustration. The host now leads the way into the house, places his friend in the seat of honor, the chief corner of the divan; then takes a seat by his side, if on a footing of equality, or kisses his hand, the hem of his garment, or even his feet (Luke vii, 38-45), according to his rank, and, retiring a few steps, crosses his hands upon his girdle—the habitual posture of a servant—thus signifying that he is waiting for orders. (Deut. x, 8; 1 Sam. xvi, 22.)

"The guest, on the other hand, seeks not to be outdone in politeness; he accepts the honors due his position, but endeavors to make his host feel at ease, by insisting upon his

sitting down. 'No, not on the floor, I beg you; nor there on the farthest corner of the divan, but here by my side.' Then follow salutations, always begun by the man of higher rank, with inquiries concerning health, and a host of empty phrases which display the good-breeding of the parties. (Churchill, 'Lebanon,' Vol. II, page 285.) The Persians excel all other Orientals in the use of these phrases and forms of etiquette; which they carry to a pitch often ridiculed by their neighbors. (Rawlinson, Herodotus, Vol. I, page 218, note) It is curious to find Herodotus (B. C. 450) states that the Persians in his day 'paid so great attention to forms of address that one could thereby at once ascertain the rank of a stranger. When of equal rank,' he says, 'instead of speaking, they would kiss each other on the lips. When one is a little inferior to the other, the kiss is given on the cheek; and when the difference of rank is great, the inferior prostrates himself upon the ground.' (Herodotus, Book I, §134). Herodotus lived and wrote when the Persian empire embraced all the lands of the Bible in Asia and Africa (B. C. 450), so that his description applies to all the East, and was doubtless as generally true in his day as in our times.

"The custom of washing the feet of a guest is not so extensively practiced at the present time as it was anciently. (Gen. xviii, 4; 1 Sam. xxv, 41; Luke vii, 44; John xii, 3, etc.) This is probably owing to the fact that the ancients mostly wore sandals; whereas, among the moderns, the more convenient morocco shoe and boot have almost wholly superseded them, except in the Desert, or among the fellahin and other peasants. Yet the custom of washing the feet is still practiced in the rural districts, and among the people farthest removed from the reach of foreign innovations, such as the inhabitants of Koordistan, of Greater or Lesser Armenia, and of Circassia."

3.—*Letters and Social Aims.* By RALPH WALDO EMERSON. Boston: Jas. R.

Osgood & Co. 16mo. pp. 314. 1876.

WE believe it is generally conceded that, as a philosophical writer, Mr. Emerson holds the first place in American letters. His style is so crisp, and his thoughts generally so profound, and, withal, so true to human experience, that it is difficult to find anywhere, in the same space, more that is worthy of our serious attention than is found in his essays. The present volume contains some of his most mature reflections, and will doubtless be received with very special interest by his many admirers.

Mr. Emerson has long been regarded as somewhat skeptical on the subject of religion. Now, we do not think there is any thing in his writings to really justify such a conclusion. Doubtless, there is much in religion, as he sees it manifested, that does not meet his approbation. But in this he is not at all peculiar. There are not a few of the best thinkers of the age who do not accept much of what is called religion as the religion of Christ in its purity and simplicity. Mr. Emerson goes back to the original fountain he sees Christ only as he is represented in the New Testament and the prophecies, and the view he gets here is not always the same as that which he sees in the various Churches around him. Hence, it is not strange that his teaching sometimes shocks the sensibilities of those that are more concerned in holding up a religious party than they are in defending the Christ of the Bible.

But any one who will read the last essay of this volume, on the subject of "Immortality," can not fail to see that Mr. Emerson is fully in sympathy

with the highest demands of human nature, as well as the plain teaching of the Word of God. We can not, at this point, forbear quoting a paragraph or two, not only to show the position which the writer holds, but also, because of the value of the thoughts suggested :

"I was lately told of young children who feel a certain terror at the assurance of life without end. 'What! will it never stop?' the child said; 'what! never die? *never, never?*' It makes me feel so tired.' And I have in mind the expression of an old believer, who once said to me: 'The thought that this frail being is never to end is so overwhelming that my only shelter is God's presence.' This disquietude only marks the transition. The healthy state of mind is the love of life. What is so good, let it endure.

"I feel that what is called great and powerful life—the administration of large affairs, in commerce, in the courts, in the State—is prone to develop narrow and special talent; but, unless combined with a certain contemplative turn—a taste for abstract truth, for the moral laws—does not build up faith or lead to content. There is a profound melancholy at the base of men of active and powerful talent seldom suspected. Many years ago there were two men in the United States Senate, both of whom are now dead. I have seen them both; one of them I personally knew. Both were men of distinction, and took an active part in the politics of their day and generation. They were men of intellect, and one of them, at a later period, gave to a friend this anecdote: He said that when he entered the Senate he became in a short time intimate with one of his colleagues, and, though attentive enough to the routine of public duty, they daily returned to each other, and spent much time in conversation on the immortality of the soul, and other intellectual questions, and cared for little else. When my friend at last left Congress they parted, his colleague remaining there, and, as their homes were widely distant from each other, it chanced that he never met him again until, twenty-five years afterward, they saw each other, through open doors, at a distance, in a crowded reception at the President's House, in Washington. Slowly they advanced toward each other, as they could, through the brilliant company, and at last met—said nothing, but shook hands long and cordially. At last his friend said: 'Any light, Albert?' 'None,' replied Albert. 'Any light, Lewis?' 'None,' replied he. They looked in each other's eyes silently, gave one more shake each to the hand he held, and thus parted for the last time. Now, I should say that the impulse which drew these minds to this inquiry through so many years was a better affirmative evidence than their failure to find a confirmation was negative. I ought to add that, though men of good minds, they were both pretty strong Materialists in their daily aims and way of life. I admit that you shall find a good deal of skepticism in the streets and hotels and places of coarse amusement. But that is only to say that the practical faculties are faster developed than the spiritual. Where there is depravity, there is a slaughter-house style of thinking. One argument of future life is the recoil of the mind in such company—our pain at every skeptical statement. The skeptic affirms that the universe is a nest of boxes, with nothing in the last box. All laughter at man is bitter, and puts us out of good activity. When Bonaparte insisted that the heart is one of the entrails; that it is the pit of the stomach that moves the world—do we thank him for the gracious instruction? Our disgust is the protest of human nature against a lie.

"The ground of hope is in the infinity of the world, which infinity reappears in every particle; the powers of all society in every individual, and of all mind in every mind. I know, against all appearances, that the universe can receive no detriment; that there is a remedy for every wrong, and a satisfaction for every soul. Here is this wonderful thought. But whence came it? Who put it in the mind? It was not I, it was not you; it is elemental—belongs to thought and virtue; and whenever we have either, we see the beams of this light. When the Master of the universe has points to carry in his government, he impresses his will in the structure of mind.

"But, proceeding to the enumeration of the few simple elements of the natural faith, the first fact that strikes us is our delight in permanence. All great natures are lovers of stability and permanence, as the type of the eternal. After science begins, belief of permanence

must follow in a healthy mind. Things so attractive, designs so wise, the secret Workman so transcendently skillful that it tasks successive generations of observers only to find out, part with part, the delicate contrivance and adjustment of a weed, of a moss, to its wants, growth, and perpetuation, all these adjustments becoming perfectly intelligible to our study, and the Contriver of it all forever hidden! To breathe, to sleep, is wonderful. But never to know the cause, the Giver, and infer his character and will! Of what import this vacant sky, these puffing elements, these insignificant lives, full of selfish loves and quarrels and ennui? Every thing is prospective, and man is to live hereafter. That the world is for his education is the only sane solution of the enigma. And I think that the naturalist works not for himself, but for the believing mind, which turns his discoveries to revelations, receives them as private tokens of the grand good will of the Creator.

"The mind delights in immense time; delights in rocks, in metals, in mountain chains, and in the evidence of vast geologic periods which these give; in the age of trees, say of the Sequoias, a few of which will span the whole history of mankind; in the noble toughness and imperishableness of the palm-tree, which thrives under abuse; delights in architecture, whose building lasts so long—"a house," says Ruskin, "is not in its prime, until it is five hundred years old," and here are the Pyramids, which have as many thousands and cromlechs and earth-mounds much older than these.

"We delight in stability, and really are interested in nothing that ends. What lasts a century pleases us in comparison with what lasts an hour. But a century, when we have once made it familiar and compare it with a true antiquity, looks dwarfish and recent; and it does not help the matter adding numbers, if we see that it has an end, which it will reach just as surely as the shortest. A candle a mile long or a hundred miles long does not help the imagination; only a self-feeding fire, an inextinguishable lamp, like the sun and the star, that we have not yet found date and origin for. But the nebular theory threatens their duration also, bereaves them of this glory, and will make a shift to eke out a sort of eternity by succession, as plants and animals do.

"And what are these delights in the vast and permanent and strong, but approximations and resemblances of what is entire and sufficing, creative and self-sustaining life? For the Creator keeps his word with us. These long-lived or long-enduring objects are to us, as we see them, only symbols of somewhat in us far longer lived. Our passions, our endeavors, have something ridiculous and mocking, if we come to so hasty an end. If not to be, how like the bells of a fool is the trump of fame! Nature does not, like the Empress Anne of Russia, call together all the architectural genius of the empire to build and finish and furnish a palace of snow, to melt again to water in the first thaw. Will you, with vast cost and pains, educate your children to be adepts in their several arts, and, as soon as they are ready to produce a masterpiece, call out a file of soldiers to shoot them down? We must infer our destiny from the preparation. We are driven by instinct to live innumerable experiences, which are of no visible value, and which we may revolve through many lives before we shall assimilate or exhaust them. Now, there is nothing in nature capricious or whimsical or accidental or unsupported. Nature never moves by jumps, but always in steady and supported advances. The implanting of a desire indicates that the gratification of that desire is in the constitution of the creature that feels it; the wish for food, the wish for motion, the wish for sleep, for society, for knowledge, are not random whims, but grounded in the structure of the creature, and meant to be satisfied by food, by motion, by sleep, by society, by knowledge. If there is the desire to live, and in larger sphere, with more knowledge and power, it is because life and knowledge and power are good for us, and we are the natural depositaries of these gifts. The love of life is out of all proportion to the value set on a single day, and seems to indicate, like all other experiences, a conviction of immense resources and possibilities proper to us, on which we have never drawn."

The other subjects discussed in this volume are as follows: "Poetry and Imagination," "Social Aims," "Eloquence," "Resources," "The Comic," "Quotation and Originality," "Progress of Culture," "Persian Poetry," "Inspiration," "Greatness." Among the best of these chapters is

the one on "Eloquence," while the one on "Progress of Culture" has much in it that is very suggestive. In fact, every part of the entire volume is full of beautiful sayings. Taking any page at random, you can pick from it two or three sentences that will live as long as literature lasts. Emerson is an author that may be read again and again, and the more frequently he is read, the more he will be admired.

4.—*Money and the Mechanism of Exchange.* By W. STANLEY JEVONS, M. A., F. R. S. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 12mo. pp. 349. 1875.

JUST now a book like this ought to be of considerable value in this country. For some time the money question here has been one of the principal questions of the day. In many of the States the Fall elections had their chief significance in this question, and, although the elections went against what is considered the expansion policy, a final settlement has not yet been reached, and will not likely be reached until our people have a better understanding of the whole subject.

This book of Mr. Jevons' is not on the currency question as it has been discussed before our people, and yet it deals with facts and principles which must be of very great value in helping us to understand the money question, even as it has been brought before the voters of this country. As a rule, this is one of the questions upon which the people are not very well informed. Suppose we ask the question which Sir Robert Peel asked, "What is a pound?" and how many people in this country could give a correct answer? But suppose we ask a different one: Why is the mint price of an ounce of gold £3. 17s. 10½d.? Now, can we hope for a correct answer from very many persons to this question? And yet the book before us puts the answer within the reach of every one.

Not the least valuable chapter in the book is the one on "The Early History of Money." In this it is shown how cattle were once used as currency, in the pastoral state, and what causes brought about the discontinuance of their use as a circulating medium in the agricultural state. In this state, instead of the ox himself, a coin stamped with his image began to circulate as money. Other articles, such as corn, indigo, sugar, rum, and tobacco, are mentioned as having served as currency in some agricultural communities.

It is impossible to follow the author, in a brief notice like this, over the ground which he travels. He shows himself to be thoroughly acquainted with all the phases of the subject, and supplies an amount of facts and arguments which can not be found in the same space anywhere else. The book ought to commend itself to every thoughtful citizen, and it is certainly invaluable to commercial men who desire to look a little beyond the ordinary routine of business to the principles which govern business.

1876.]

Every-Day Religion.

- 5.—*Two Lectures upon the Relations of Civil Law to Church Polity, Discipline, and Property.* By Hon. WILLIAM STRONG, LL. D. New York: Dodd & Mead. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 12mo. pp. 141. 1875.

WE have in these lectures another live subject discussed. Evidently, one of the important questions of the age is the relation of civil law to Church polity, discipline, and progress. In the first place, these lectures will help the reader to understand the present laws on this subject. This, we think, will be of service, especially to Church people, many of whom really do not understand often how to proceed in a matter of simple corporation. And, in the second place, these lectures make important suggestions, especially to ministers of the Gospel, in regard to matters which come up almost every day for their management. In fact, the lectures were mainly intended for ministers, and we think that this class can not fail to derive much benefit from their perusal.

- 6.—*The Might and Mirth of Literature.* By J. W. V. MACBETH. New York: Harper & Bros. 12mo. pp. 542. 1875.

THE object of this volume, as stated in an introductory note, is, "to create and fully equip a new branch of study; to discuss figures of speech far more thoroughly than ever has been done; to urge upon pleaders, and all who write and speak English, many very important practical advices; to comment specially on Shakespeare, Milton, Demosthenes, and the Bible; to present a wide review of American and English literature; and to make the whole subject as amusing and laughter-exciting as it is instructive. Also, we have availed ourselves of our familiarity with Latin, Greek, and with four of the modern languages, French, German, Italian, and Spanish."

We think a careful examination will convince the reader that the author has very largely fulfilled his promise, and has given us a volume not only instructive, but also highly entertaining. The author evidently shows himself to be well acquainted with English and American writers, and he has given us selections from a wide field, embracing a variety that ought to satisfy almost every one. We recommend the work as a fresh and vigorous contribution to a subject that had almost grown stale by a constant repetition of the old authors.

- 7.—*Every-day Religion.* Sermons Delivered in the Brooklyn Tabernacle, by the Rev. T. DEWITT TALMAGE. New York: Harper and Brothers. 12mo. pp. 420. 1875.

THESE sermons have their strong and weak points, and both of these are very distinctly marked. Mr. Talmage preaches to a large congregation, and evidently exerts a great deal of influence from his pulpit. The teaching of his sermons is, for the most part, in the right direction. Certainly,

his aim is to make men better, to lift them up into a higher life, and give them new inspirations for life's conflict; but his style is sometimes very objectionable, his attitudinizing often ridiculous, and his straining for effect is too apparent to produce effect, except upon the minds of very ignorant people. But, notwithstanding these defects, his sermons are likely to produce considerable influence, for they have some very fine qualities, as well as some that are not so fine. Many practical truths are stated, with a force that is scarcely equaled in any other sermons of the day, and the variety is quite sufficient to meet the demands of a very large audience. We think the names of his subjects are sometimes far-fetched, and might be written over an essay on "Symmes' Hole" with almost as much appropriateness as where we find them. But we presume every man must be allowed to name his own offspring by whatever name he may choose, and all outside interference must be regarded as an impertinence. So we will not obtrude our views any further in this direction.

8—*Wife No. 19.* By ANN ELIZA YOUNG. Hartford, Conn.; Chicago and Cincinnati: Dustin, Gilman & Co. 8vo. pp. 605. 1875.

If this book is to be accepted as a trustworthy representation of the rise and progress of Mormonism, and what Mormonism is, then it must be obvious that the American people, as a whole, have had but a faint idea of the iniquity of the Mormon system, and must henceforth be regarded as doubly culpable, if they allow this pestiferous stench to remain on this continent. If we judge of the trustworthiness of the narrative by internal evidence, we must believe that Ann Eliza is sincere and truthful in her representations, and that she has not overdrawn the picture in any respect. Then there are external evidences corroborating this view of the matter. Hence, taking all the facts together, we are inclined to credit, in the main, the statements of the volume before us. It is largely a personal narrative, and is intensely interesting from beginning to end. It introduces us to the inner temple of Mormonism, and gives us the *animus* of the whole system. As a picture of the complete degradation of woman, as well as perversion of the true idea of social and religious life, it will be found a most interesting study. To all who are concerned in human progress, and especially the development of a true social order, the book can not fail to be of considerable value.

9.—*The Masque of Pandora, and Other Poems.* By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. 16mo. pp. 146. 1876.

A NEW volume of poems by Longfellow is always welcome; this one is especially so, for it contains some of his very best poetry. We regard "Morituri Salutamus" as the best poem of its kind in any language. We

do not wonder that Longfellow should have declined writing a Centennial poem. He could scarcely have hoped to equal his poem for the "Fiftieth Anniversary of the Class of 1835 in Bowdoin College." The other poems of this volume are all good; some of them very beautiful. We note among the best the one on Charles Sumner.

-
- 10.—*John Todd: The Story of His Life.* An Autobiography. New York: Harper & Bros. 8vo. pp. 529. 1876.

BIOGRAPHY is, after all, the most instructive reading. One man is, in many respects, a miniature world. Hence, to study the development of one man is to study the development of the race. Of course, this statement is subject to certain modifications, but in an important particular it is true. The science of man is by far the most important of all sciences. To classify and become intimately acquainted with the habits of the lower animals may be profitable enough; knowledge thus obtained is not to be despised. But, if it be important to understand the life and character of the lower animals, how much more important is it to understand the life and character of him who has been placed at the head of the animal kingdom, and who is lord over all the works of creation,

Of course, the wider his sphere of action, the more important the biography of one man becomes; and this brings us to say that the story of Dr. Todd's life is not only important because he is a fair representative man, but because the varied incidents connected with his life are such as to give to his history an unusual interest. We can not now follow him as the story of his life is developed in the volume before us. But we can most heartily recommend the volume to every one who would read a very entertaining and also a highly instructive book.

-
- 11.—*Daily Thoughts.* By Rev. T. DE WITT TALMAGE, D. D. New York: Dodd & Mead. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 8vo. pp. 496. 1875.

THE plan of this work is a selection from Dr. Talmage's writings, for every day in the year. Of course, the selections are entirely arbitrary, each one being quite as well adapted for any other day's reading as for the one to which it is assigned. Still, if this fancy of the editor will serve to bring the forcible thoughts of the Brooklyn preacher into greater popularity, we shall make no objection.

We have already remarked on Dr. Talmage's style; it is often very far from what we could wish. Sometimes it is pure rant. This, however, is largely compensated for by some eloquent sentences and intensely interesting practical suggestions. We think the selections in this volume are, for the most part, judiciously made, and each one is short enough to be read

in a few minutes. It is a book that may be taken up every day and a chapter or two read with profit. The following, on "Piety at Home," is arranged for December 11th, but we think it might be read every day in the year without any damage to those for whom it is intended :

"Prayers in the household will not make up for every thing. Some of the best people in the world are the hardest to get along with. There are people, who stand up in prayer-meetings and pray like an angel, who, at home, are uncompromising and cranky. You may not have every thing just as you want it. Sometimes it will be the duty of the husband, and sometimes of the wife, to yield ; but both stand punctiliously on your rights, and you will have a Waterloo, with no Blucher coming up at night-fall to decide the conflict. Never be ashamed to apologize when you have done wrong in domestic affairs. Let that be a law of your household. The best thing I ever heard of my grandfather, whom I never saw, was this : that once having unrighteously rebuked one of his children, he, himself having lost his patience, and perhaps having been misinformed of the child's doings, found out his mistake, and, in the evening of the same day, gathered all his family together, and said : 'Now I have an explanation to make, and one thing to say. Thomas, this morning I rebuked you very unfairly. I am sorry for it. I rebuked you in the presence of the whole family, and now I ask your forgiveness in their presence.' It must have taken some courage to do that. It was right, was it not ? Never be ashamed to apologize for domestic inaccuracy. Find out the points, what are the weak points, if I may call them so, of your companion, and then stand aloof from them. Do not carry the fire of your temper too near the gunpowder. If the wife be easily fretted by disorder in the household, let the husband be careful where he throws his slippers. If the husband comes home from the store with his patience all exhausted, do not let the wife unnecessarily cross his temper. But both stand up for your rights, and I will promise you an everlasting sound of the war-whoop. Your life will be spent in making up, and marriage will be to you an unmitigated curse. Cowper said :

"The kindest and the happiest pair
Will find occasion to forbear ;
And something, every day they live,
'To pity and perhaps forgive.'"

12.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms.* With a New Translation. By JAS. G. MURPHY, LL. D., T. C. D. Andover: W. F. Draper. 8vo. pp. 694. 1875.

THIS is unquestionably a book of superior merit. It is a scholarly work, but is sufficiently popular in its style of treatment to be serviceable to a large class of readers who are unable to consult with profit many of the more elaborate works. The notes are generally excellent, treating precisely the right thing, and with conciseness and clearness. The translation is also of very great value ; but we look in vain for some alterations that ought to have been made. The old punctuation is followed in some places where surely a scholar ought to have seen the mistake. We give one notable instance : In Psalm xc, 4-7, we have this language and punctuation in the old version :

"For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday when it is past, and as a watch in the night. Thou carriest them away as with a flood ; they are as a sleep : in the morning they are like grass which groweth up. In the morning it flourisheth, and groweth up ; in the evening it is cut down, and withereth."

This new version renders the same verses and gives the punctuation as follows :

"For a thousand years are in thy eyes as yesterday when it passeth, and as a watch in the night. Thou sweepest them away; asleep are they. In the morning they are like grass that changeth. In the morning it bloometh and changeth; in the evening, it is cut down and withereth."

It will be seen that the punctuation in both of these versions is practically the same, and is really very ridiculous, failing entirely to give the sense of the original. Let us read the old version, with the following punctuation, and see how beautiful, as well as appropriate, is the language. In the fourth verse read: "They are as sleep in the morning: they are like grass which groweth up." That is, "a thousand years" are, with God, *as a morning sleep*. Every one can see how important this change in the punctuation is. But as it stands in both the versions before us, it is simply not only without meaning, but destroys the sense of the passage. But by bringing forward the colon which is after "sleep," and putting it after "morning," the sense is complete, and the figure is at once highly poetical and appropriate.

In many places this version is a very great improvement on the old one, but we have now no space to make further references.

13.—*Rocks Ahead; or, Warnings by Cassandra*. By W. F. GREG. Boston: Jas. R. Osgood & Co. 12mo. pp. 233. 1875.

MR. GREG'S books are always readable. Whatever may be justly charged against him, he can not be charged with dullness. He is evidently a wide-awake man, sees the world as it is, and lives in close relation to the most active events of the day, and is quite fearless in expressing his views on all questions relating to political, social, and religious life.

Some papers of this volume are very valuable to the general reader, but they nearly all have a special interest for the people of Great Britain. The chapter on the "Religious Rock" is, of course, written from the broad-gauge stand-point; and while some of its facts are unquestionable, and some of its arguments unanswerable, nevertheless, much allowance must be made for the general coloring. Mr. Greg is not in a position to write with entire calmness and judicial correctness on the religious question. He belongs to that class of men who seem intensely mad against religion because some men have perverted it. It seems to us it would be far better to wage a warfare against these men, and let religion alone. But this, we suppose, does not answer Mr. Greg's purpose, and hence truth itself often receives the blows which ought to fall in another place. Still, the book, as a whole, is well worth reading, and some portions of it merit careful study. It will doubtless excite considerable attention.

VOL. VIII.—9

- 14.—*Roderick Hudson*. By HENRY JAMES, JR. Boston: Jas. R. Osgood & Co. 12mo. 482 pp. 1876.

THIS, we believe, is Mr. James's first attempt at writing a sustained story, and, for the good of the public, it will be as well if it is his last. We say this not because the book is without merit, for Mr. James could write very little, even if he were to try, that would not have some merit. He is a thinker, and has, withal, a pure style, but it is a style entirely without warmth, and is therefore unfitted for novel-writing. The characters and incidents of *Roderick Hudson* are well worthy a more enthusiastic treatment, but in Mr. James' style every thing is nearly as cold as Winter in Greenland. Making love in Mr. James' novels is simply out of the question, unless it be according to that anecdote of rustic life where we find that a certain inevitable "Sally" was made to blush, after spending an almost silent evening with her "true love," by being threatened in the following manner: "Sally," said the before-named true-love, at the same time taking up a little piece of fire-wood that had rolled down, with one end blazing finely; "Sally," said he, "I have a great notion to burn you with this chunk." "What for?" exclaimed the astonished Sally. "Because you won't have me." "You never asked me," was the quick reply. "Well, then, now I ask you." "Well, then, now I have you," was the response, with an emphasis that made "John" feel well assured that all was right. The only way to make Mr. James' novels tolerable is to introduce the "chunk" scene. This would put at least a little fire into his book, and this is precisely what is needed. Until this is done we shall not hear of very many editions of "*Roderick Hudson*."

- 15.—*Currency and Banking*. By BONAMY PRICE. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 12mo. pp. 176 1876.

THIS is a book that will at once command attention. It discusses questions which the American people just now should thoroughly understand. It supplements very finely the book of Professor Jevons on "*Money and the Mechanism of Exchange*," and the two together furnish about all the information that is needed to bring the whole subject fairly before our people. Its contents are as follows: Metallic Currency, Paper Currency, Convertible Bank-notes, The Bank Charter Act of 1844, What is a Bank? Inconvertible Bank-notes.

- 16.—*Sermons*. By Rev. FREDERICK BROOKS. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. 12mo. pp. 299. 1876.

THERE are some really excellent sermons in this book, and this, we think, is saying a good deal for the volume, for, as a rule, published sermons are

not worth the paper they are printed on. But, aside from the real value of these sermons, the volume itself has a special interest on account of the untimely death of the author. He came to his death by falling through the imperfect flooring of a bridge into the river which swept under it. He had just become editor of *The Standard of the Cross*, and had gone to Boston to arrange for his new field of labor, when the accident occurred. It is well that we have his sermons preserved in so neat a volume.

- 17.—*Illustrated Cincinnati*. By D. J. KENNY. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 12mo. pp. 345. 1875.

THIS book has not only a great local interest, but it has an interest to people who do not live in Cincinnati. The material resources, the educational, religious, and benevolent institutions, in fact, all that belongs to a great city, can not fail to be of interest to nearly every body, if these matters are presented in an intelligent and concise style; and this is precisely what we can say for the book before us. The editor has evidently shown considerable industry in gathering his materials, and also very great skill in managing these materials. So that, while every thing is not so satisfactory and full as we should like it, we believe he has done his work about as well as it could be done, in the same space, under all the circumstances. We therefore take pleasure in recommending his book as giving, in the main, a very fair outline representation of Cincinnati as it was in 1875.

- 18.—*Notes, Explanatory and Practical, upon the International Sunday-school Lessons for the Year 1876*. By Rev. RUFUS W. CLARK, D. D. New York: Dodd & Mead. 12mo. pp. 177. 1876.

THESE notes seem to be, for the most part, well adapted to the purpose of Sunday-school instruction; and as the price is within the range of every one, we should think this little volume ought to come into the hands of a great many Sunday-school workers. Our faith is not altogether assured in these extemporized helps for the Sunday-school, but we are willing to give them a fair trial before condemning them.

- 19.—*Englishmen of Science: Their Nature and Nurture*. By FRANCIS GALTON, F. R. S. New York: D. Appleton & Co. Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 16mo. pp. 206. 1875.

THERE is much valuable information in this little volume, both of history and science. It belongs to the "Popular Science Library," and is in every way a worthy companion of those that precede it.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

BOOKS.

- 1.—*Die Deutschen Zeitschriften und die Entstehung der oeffentlichen Meinung. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Zeitungswesens. Von HEINRICH WUTTKE. Dritte vortgefuhrte Auflage.* (The German Journals and the Origin of Public Opinion. A Contribution to the History of the Newspaper System. By HENRICH WUTTKE. Third Continued Edition.) Leipsic. 8vo. pp. 446. 1875.

PROFESSOR WUTTKE, of Leipsic, enjoys a well-earned reputation as an author, in Germany. His works, about forty in number, cover a wide range of subjects. Many treat of German history, past and present; several are on some of the most important questions that concern the German nation at this hour. Wüttke is not of those German scholars, of whom there are, too many, that have so buried themselves in school dust that they have become choked by it, and know nothing of the pure, vital, inspiring atmosphere that the present world, outside of the murky school air, is breathing, and that is giving this generation such a spirit of life, power, and freedom; he is one of the better, more developed, and more useful men—men of a healthier mind—that are in full life-fellowship with the best tendencies and strivings of our age. He is one of those men that hate a lie, that are the enemies of the corruption and enslavement of the souls of men—one of that noble older stamp of German spirits, that loved candor, truth, purity of mind and purpose, freedom; that were bold and brave to utter the necessary truth before all men, kings and beggars. Wüttke is a man whom, when you have read, you must love and honor, if your own heart is right. Germany will always have—it can not be otherwise—a phalanx of such true men; and they are there now, in spite of the present unwonted general demoralization and enslavement of mind by the almost irresistible tide of influence from the iron-clad power above, and of the public mind led captive, by its evil arts.

Wüttke is a true *German*; one who is not willing to sacrifice *Germany* its freedom, its honor, its good, to the idolatrous devotion to a dynasty and a tribe, and their boundless ambition. He is, as he has long been, one of the foremost, most pronounced soldiers of *German freedom* in the true sense, full, rational, constitutional freedom; and the generous, ardent spirit of freedom breathes throughout all he says. His hatred of falsehood and crooked ways burns in every line. Those noble German words, *gerade nicht krumme wege* ("straight not crooked ways"), are his motto and his guide; and he scourges these "crooked ways" wherever he finds them. It

is an easy matter and a very common thing, ever acceptable to the thoughtless mass, to expose the weaknesses and vices of our enemies, and of those beyond us ; it is rare, but a noble deed, although most unacceptable, and not seldom dangerous, to uncover and seek to correct the vices and shortcomings of our own home ; but he that will honestly take upon himself and well execute the latter task is the true friend and benefactor of his people. Such a task Wüttke has sought to perform for his nation in the book before us ; with what success, time must tell.

The object of this book is to give a true idea of the present state of the newspaper press in Germany, and how public opinion is manufactured by it. The picture, drawn from an abundance of reliable data, reveals the fact, that the journalistic press of Germany is in a state of extreme abject venality, servility, and bondage, in the new German empire, to the Government at Berlin ; and, in Germany generally, of extreme venality toward the money power—bank and stock speculators ; as well as toward the book publishers, the stage, etc. The center of the corruption of the press, by the money power, is Vienna—that great field of stock speculation. This is not surprising, since Vienna is, in some of the most important social respects, the most corrupt city in enlightened Europe.

It is no new thing to learn that the newspaper press is venal, and in bondage to the political power ; we knew also before that this evil had been greatly aggravated within the last ten years in Germany, but we were not prepared for the terrible revelations Professor Wüttke makes.

It seems that a *Press-bureau* exists in Berlin, established and controlled by the Government—at present by Bismarck—that, by the expenditure of immense sums of money which are placed at its disposal, controls by purchase and subventions, by bribery, the press of Germany, and carries its dominion, by the same means, even far away into foreign lands, wherever it is of interest to manufacture public opinion in favor of the German Government. Doubtless, other nations have done this, and in the same way ; but this does not cover the sin ; and it is the wide extent and completeness of this base dominion that surprises ; moreover, and above all, is it amazing and repulsive, when it is coupled, as in this case, with the highest and loudest pretensions of *liberty, truth, honor, and morality*, both on the part of the Government and of the press that is in this abject state of baseness, so that it beams, as Wüttke declares, all around a most gigantic hypocrisy, to deceive both the German nation and the nations beyond.

The book reveals to us, from the most reliable sources of proof, that, by means of an enslaved, bought-up press, a systematic, powerful effort has for years been made, and is now made as perhaps never before, by the Government, to create a public opinion, for the furtherance of its own ends, that rests largely on an entirely false representation of facts ; and

that this public opinion is wholly misguided, perverted, and therefore most dangerous and ruinous.

The greater part of the book was written before the events of 1866; but it has now been republished, and continued, with a large addition, to the present date; so that we now have a picture of the state of the newspaper press in Germany for the last ten years.

It can easily be imagined that the appearance of such a book, in 1866 and in 1875, would not meet, in the state of the North German mind then and now, with favor. Our author frankly, in the present edition, gives us some of the very hostile, sometimes frenzied and vulgar, denunciations his book received at its first appearance, from the press whose corruptions it exposed. The book was altogether unpopular. He tells us candidly that by the end of 1866 only three hundred and three copies had been sold. This was not at all surprising, as the Prussian mind was just then in a *furor* of wild enthusiasm that would all be against the book; and "all the powers that be," except truth—and its voice was drowned in wilder, louder cries—were against it. By and by, however, the bravery and nobleness of Professor Wüttke's act were recognized, and the book has been widely read and commended by the best men. Many of the noblest spirits of Germany wrote encouraging and grateful letters to the author. Edward Pelz wrote in 1866:

"If your book does not rouse up Germany from its sleep to active reforms, then it must be given up as lost."

Heinrich Ewald, one of Germany's noblest men, now no more—he died last March—wrote to the author in February last:

"Your excellent book I read on my sick bed, to my greatest encouragement and comfort, and with the deepest feeling of gratitude to you. God has once more strengthened you to tell the Germans the right thing at the right time. You may be sure of the thanks of the best among them; and what more can an author desire?"

A former Minister wrote after the first appearance of the book:

"We all felt that some demoniac power was striving among us to possess itself even of the world of thought. But who understood the invisible, mysterious connection? You bring the truth mercilessly into the light. The destructive and scandalous trade of falsifying the truth, which was formerly carried on *negatively* by the censorship, is now carried on in a *positive* way; manliness and straight-forwardness is suppressed, German self-admiration, stupidity, and baseness are advanced and protected. In many respects the new way is yet immensely more destructive than the old. Then every author was the natural enemy of the censorship; now many of these co-operate in it. However unfree, unpractical, vain and illiberal and worthless, the German nation had become through the censorship, so far, at least at that time, the demoralization could not prevail, as to bring to the furtherance of this servile system such immense masses of the best intellectual powers of the land, and, at the same time, so many readers be found as now for the servile newspapers.

"The effect of this system of base gain—not of honest industry—will yet end to the terror of its present aiders and abettors. . . . It is all over with the reign of noble ideas, with the power of the love of Father-land and of liberty, with the dignity and honorableness of the national character. Money only is now valued; and all means to gain possession of it seem natural and honorable."

To the truthfulness of the statement of Professor Wüttke, there are abundant testimonials, and from the best sources. An eminent publisher, who also was proprietor of a newspaper, wrote to the author :

"Every honest man that has had to do with the newspaper business is able to subscribe to every line you have written, as the pure truth. You have done a service that can not be sufficiently appreciated, to the public that has long been so successfully led astray by the present flourishing corruption."

The *Constitutionelle Zeitung* of Dresden, politically opposed to the author, calls the book,

"An exceedingly valuable and highly important work, a work that in rapid, bold strokes furnishes us a true picture of the nature and spirit of the journalistic press. It would be great injustice to the author not to recognize in him rare knowledge of the subject, keenness of observation, and brilliancy of representation. It is only to be regretted, that sometimes there is revealed a political and party bias that seems to us not altogether impartial, and at least belongs to the dead past. Freed from these, the treatise can lay claim, in its field, to a truly classical value."

This, from a political opponent, is high praise. Another eminent journal says :

"The picture Wüttke has sketched, based on an observation of twenty years, . . . is true and real, to its smallest, finest touches."

This is sufficient to give confidence in the truthfulness of Wüttke's work ; the work itself, the method of proof, and the spirit of honesty and candor that pervades it, are of themselves a sufficient commendation to our confidence. We have space only for a few short extracts from Wüttke's book :

"A high official in Berlin said to a friend who intimated that a proposed measure of the Government might produce a bad effect on public opinion, 'There is nothing to fear, for we have the entire press in our power.' And indeed it is so. Prussia controls public opinion."

"Official and officious papers, and articles proceeding from the Press-bureau, are in the service of the ministry. With reference to the officious press (those ever ready to serve the ministry), Prince Bismarck replied to a question of Herman Raster, 'All I ask, is, that the newspapers shall allow me so much blank space for the contribution sent out from here ; beyond that they can write what they please. Aegidi has the whole matter in his hands, but Bucher has the directing control.'"

The two men here named are the heads of the ministerial Press-bureau.

"In the Press-bureau—with which institution I became acquainted in 1866—there are daily made out directions, which inform the independent authors and journals how they are to treat the questions then before the public, and what direction they are to give to public opinion. Whatever information Hahn and Aegidi have received, from the highest powers above them, are embodied by them in orders which are sent to the 'director of the bureau,' from whom those writers of the press in Berlin 'who have the opportunity of being informed of the position of the Government' receive this programme of the day. Sometimes the order of the day is immediately dictated to the press writers, 'as the parole is given to the sergeants on parade.' To the journals outside of Berlin these communications are sent."

After the great events of 1866, "the Press-bureau was greatly enlarged. In November the Estates had granted to the Ministry of the Interior, for the purposes of this bureau, 31,000 thalers, under the title of '*Dispositions-fond*' (that is, contingent fund). In the discussions that then arose, Wagener said : 'Consider the feeling in the newly annexed lands.'

In South Germany [not then yet united to the new confederation] we can hardly expect to find papers friendly to Prussia without some effort on the part of the Prussian Government. Two new appropriations were then made, granting together 70,000 thalers to the Government, to be used with the press. But much greater sums were soon placed at the disposition of the Press-bureau, when the Prussian Government appropriated to itself the chief part of the private revenues of the King of Hanover, and of the Elector of Hesse."

This new fund, amounting to millions, furnished a boundless supply, that was used to buy and control the press of Germany, and even beyond Germany. It received the name of "*Reptile Fund*," by which it is now known. This now well-known name had its origin in a remark of Bismarck, made during the discussions of that time, that he "would pursue these evil-disposed *reptiles*" into their holes, to observe what they were doing." The fund taken from the two conquered provinces was used for this chase after the reptiles, and the manufacturing of public opinion.

The Germans, after all, do not seem to have much respect for these newspaper tools servilely in the hands of the ministry. Each separate class of these venal writers has its own appellation. They are known as *sanhisten* (swineherds), *schlamm-bader* (such as swim and move about in filth and mire). *Waschzettel* is the slang word applied to the instructions issued by the leaders of the bureau—that is, *wash-directions*, indicating the white-washing business these servile writers are to do. Those lower instruments for distributing informations, and informations that are in *immediate* connection with the bureau, are called, in the *jargon* of this system, *pfeiffer*, pipers.

"The activity of this institution is extended far beyond the limits of the empire, to control the public opinion abroad, and, by the publication of pretended judgments of English, French, and other observers, to harden the Germans against the influence of those who express at home unfavorable opinions of the acts of the Government. The articles furnished from Berlin to the foreign press are telegraphed back by Wolff's telegraph, and reproduced in the press at home as the expressions of foreign opinion. I could name the Press-reptiles whose business it was to supply the *Independance Belge*, and the *Hour* (of London), and who had to write for Scandinavian and Italian journals.

"In 1869 there existed in Berlin, to direct the opinions of the English, a *North German Correspondence*, and also a *Correspondance de Berlin*, for France; and since January, 1869, a *North German Correspondence* was printed for the instruction of English and American papers, and was then further distributed and managed by agencies in New York and London. . . . Large sums are used by the German embassies at foreign courts for the same purpose."

And so the story goes on from page to page throughout the book. Many leading newspapers have been bought in foreign countries, as in Vienna, by means of the *Reptilien-fond*, sometimes at an enormous price, and are conducted in the interest of the Prussian Government. We close with one of the most odious instances of the direct designed falsifications of truth we have met in the entire history of modern times.

When the Prussians and Austrians were arrayed in the field against each other in 1866, the Prussian Government had printed, and caused to be circulated in its army, and to be publicly read to the companies, what pur-

ported to be the "military order" or address of Benedek, the Austrian commander-in-chief, to his army. It is a long, windy document, filled with the most odious allusions to the Prussians, insolent, foolish bravado, and every thing calculated to arouse the bitterest feelings in the breasts of the Prussians against the Austrians. This "order" of Benedek was also printed and circulated in the Prussian papers at that time, and has been incorporated as historic fact in some of the Prussian *histories* of that war. And yet the whole was, out and out, a base forgery, got up by the Prussians for effect. Wüttke gives the true "order" and the false one, side by side; they are wholly unlike each other. The real one is not more than half the length of the forged one, is couched in simple, unostentatious language, worthy of a soldier, and has in it not one word of all the odious and braggart language of the Prussian falsification. Comment on such an act is wholly unnecessary; but it is a full illustration of the manner in which, in that quarter, public opinion is created.

The exposure of this fraud, in Wüttke's book, awakened much surprise and indignation, and an honorable Prussian officer said to Wüttke, that when he saw the pretended "order" of Benedek, he said he could not believe that this eminent German field-marshal could have written so contemptible a document.

Wüttke's book will increase in effect year by year, as the delirium of the hour passes away, and ancient honor and love of truth and freedom gain the ascendancy over the present reign of fraud, venality, and servility, and of an iron power that crushes out all opposition.

2.—*Lettre de M. l'Evêque d'Orleans à M. Minghetti, Ministre des Finances du Roi Victor Emmanuel, sur la Spoliation de l'Eglise à Rome et en Italie. Sixième Edition. Publiée avec la Lettre au Journal La France, et avec le Bref du Saint Père.* (Letter of the Bishop of Orleans to M. Minghetti, Minister of Finance of King Victor Emanuel, on the Spoliation of the Church at Rome and in Italy. Sixth Edition. Published with the Letter to the *Journal La France*, and with the Pastoral Letter of the Holy Father.) Paris. Brochure. 1874.

Les Lois Ecclésiastiques de l'Italie. Réponse à M. l'Evêque d'Orleans. (The Ecclesiastical Laws of Italy. Answer to the Bishop of Orleans.) Paris, Rome, Turin, Florence. Brochure. pp. 77. 1874.

No more terrible blow, no deeper humiliation, in the eyes of Catholics, and in fact of the world, has happened to the Papacy, more particularly to the Pope, in his person and character as Pope, than the despoiling he and his Church have suffered in Rome and Italy. That the Pope, Catholics, and the world should so regard it, is quite natural. *Italy* has done this; the Pope's *own peculiar nation and people; his own house and*

In South Germany [not then yet united to the new confederation] we can hardly expect to find papers friendly to Prussia without some effort on the part of the Prussian Government. Two new appropriations were then made, granting together 70,000 thalers to the Government, to be used with the press. But much greater sums were soon placed at the disposition of the Press-bureau, when the Prussian Government appropriated to itself the chief part of the private revenues of the King of Hanover, and of the Elector of Hesse."

This new fund, amounting to millions, furnished a boundless supply, that was used to buy and control the press of Germany, and even beyond Germany. It received the name of "*Reptile Fund*," by which it is now known. This now well-known name had its origin in a remark of Bismarck, made during the discussions of that time, that he "would pursue these evil-disposed *reptiles* into their holes, to observe what they were doing." The fund taken from the two conquered provinces was used for this chase after the reptiles, and the manufacturing of public opinion.

The Germans, after all, do not seem to have much respect for these newspaper tools servilely in the hands of the ministry. Each separate class of these venal writers has its own appellation. They are known as *sanhisten* (swineherds), *schlambader* (such as swim and move about in filth and mire). *Waschzettel* is the slang word applied to the instructions issued by the leaders of the bureau—that is, *wash-directions*, indicating the white-washing business these servile writers are to do. Those lower instruments for distributing informations, and informations that are in *immediate* connection with the bureau, are called, in the *jargon* of this system, *pfeiffer*, pipers.

"The activity of this institution is extended far beyond the limits of the empire, to control the public opinion abroad, and, by the publication of pretended judgments of English, French, and other observers, to harden the Germans against the influence of those who express at home unfavorable opinions of the acts of the Government. The articles furnished from Berlin to the foreign press are telegraphed back by Wolff's telegraph, and reproduced in the press at home as the expressions of foreign opinion. I could name the Press-reptiles whose business it was to supply the *Independence Belge*, and the *Hour* (of London), and who had to write for Scandinavian and Italian journals.

"In 1869 there existed in Berlin, to direct the opinions of the English, a *North German Correspondence*, and also a *Correspondance de Berlin*, for France; and since January, 1869, a *North German Correspondence* was printed for the instruction of English and American papers, and was then further distributed and managed by agencies in New York and London. . . . Large sums are used by the German embassies at foreign courts for the same purpose."

And so the story goes on from page to page throughout the book. Many leading newspapers have been bought in foreign countries, as in Vienna, by means of the *Reptilien-fond*, sometimes at an enormous price, and are conducted in the interest of the Prussian Government. We close with one of the most odious instances of the direct designed falsifications of truth we have met in the entire history of modern times.

When the Prussians and Austrians were arrayed in the field against each other in 1866, the Prussian Government had printed, and caused to be circulated in its army, and to be publicly read to the companies, what pur-

ported to be the "military order" or address of Benedek, the Austrian commander-in-chief, to his army. It is a long, windy document, filled with the most odious allusions to the Prussians, insolent, foolish bravado, and every thing calculated to arouse the bitterest feelings in the breasts of the Prussians against the Austrians. This "order" of Benedek was also printed and circulated in the Prussian papers at that time, and has been incorporated as historic fact in some of the Prussian *histories* of that war. And yet the whole was, out and out, a base forgery, got up by the Prussians for effect. Wüttke gives the true "order" and the false one, side by side; they are wholly unlike each other. The real one is not more than half the length of the forged one, is couched in simple, unostentatious language, worthy of a soldier, and has in it not one word of all the odious and braggart language of the Prussian falsification. Comment on such an act is wholly unnecessary; but it is a full illustration of the manner in which, in that quarter, public opinion is created.

The exposure of this fraud, in Wüttke's book, awakened much surprise and indignation, and an honorable Prussian officer said to Wüttke, that when he saw the pretended "order" of Benedek, he said he could not believe that this eminent German field-marshal could have written so contemptible a document.

Wüttke's book will increase in effect year by year, as the delirium of the hour passes away, and ancient honor and love of truth and freedom gain the ascendancy over the present reign of fraud, venality, and servility, and of an iron power that crushes out all opposition.

2.—*Lettre de M. l'Evêque d'Orleans à M. Minghetti, Ministre des Finances du Roi Victor Emmanuel, sur la Spoliation de l'Eglise à Rome et en Italie. Sixième Edition. Publiée avec la Lettre au Journal La France, et avec le Bref du Saint Père.* (Letter of the Bishop of Orleans to M. Minghetti, Minister of Finance of King Victor Emmanuel, on the Spoliation of the Church at Rome and in Italy. Sixth Edition. Published with the Letter to the *Journal La France*, and with the Pastoral Letter of the Holy Father.) Paris. Brochure. 1874.

Les Lois Ecclesiastiques de l'Italie. Réponse à M. l'Evêque d'Orleans. (The Ecclesiastical Laws of Italy. Answer to the Bishop of Orleans.) Paris, Rome, Turin, Florence. Brochure. pp. 77. 1874.

No more terrible blow, no deeper humiliation, in the eyes of Catholics, and in fact of the world, has happened to the Papacy, more particularly to the Pope, in his person and character as Pope, than the despoiling he and his Church have suffered in Rome and Italy. That the Pope, Catholics, and the world should so regard it, is quite natural. *Italy* has done this; the Pope's own *peculiar nation and people*; his own house and

children. In the *home* of the Holy Father, where he has lived and ruled, "as a father," often with such unlimited home-rule, for ages ; in the city and land where are the most devoted, and the greatest number, of his servants, where, it would be supposed, he had the greatest influence over his own ; where he had the fashioning of the people ; where he was, as the great hierarch, most seen and observed and best known,—here, and by his own, this blow has been struck ; here he has been so lamentably "despoiled." This alone would be enough ; but this is not all. A great part of his power over the world came from the pomp and glory with which he was surrounded as a temporal monarch, and from his having his see at Rome, the "eternal city," and the center of the Catholic world and glory. The Pope himself, and the loyal, earnest defenders of his temporal power at Rome, know this full well, and hence the tenacity with which they defended this power, and the violent grief and passion they manifest at its loss. The glory in which the Pope sat enthroned at Rome dazzled with its light the whole Catholic world. When, moreover, it is understood what a power among men his position as a temporal monarch gave the Pope, having near him ambassadors from all the kingdoms of the world, through whom he maintained a direct connection and a potent influence with all these nations ; and what power he swayed by his own ambassadors, the Papal nuncios, these astute, crafty diplomatists, which he maintained near the thrones and powers of the earth,—when this is understood, as the Papacy well understands it, it is easy to comprehend the wail of agony that comes up from the Papal heart at the loss of all this. The vast history of the skillful diplomacies of Rome through this double line of ambassadors, that constitute so much of its past history, and that was so potent to extend and maintain its dominion over the nations, is gone, and will now never more be repeated. Who can fail to see that the loss of the Pope's worldly crown will dim more and more the glory of the spiritual, in the eyes of men, even of the most Catholic nations, who so often felt and not seldom resisted the tyranny of the Pope? How clearly the Pope himself sees this, and how deeply he feels it, is seen in the bitterness of his sorrow when he saw the representatives of nations, especially accredited to him, one by one depart to return no more. On the entablatures over the gates of the Vatican, and on the walls of all the chambers of that renowned palace, he sees written, as by the hand of Fate, "Thy glory is departed." The cardinals, and all the cunning doctors of Rome, have too well read and studied the past history of the papal power not to know how great and irreparable to the Papacy and the Romish Church is the loss of the temporal power of the Pope.

"The spoliation of the Church" in Rome and Italy, by the Government of Victor Emanuel, has been, since the establishment of the Italian kingdom and the occupancy of Rome, the subject of unceasing and bitterest

denunciations of the Italian Government by the Pope and his faithful followers, from the Vatican hill to the ends of the earth. The advocates of the Papacy and "the Church" have sought to move heaven and earth by their extravagant portraiture of "this black crime against the Spouse of Christ and the Anointed of God." It is interesting to see, with a near view, both the full indictment, in spirit, style, and substance, made out by spiritual Rome against the Italian Government, and the defense of the latter; all this we find in the two documents at the head of this notice.

No man, certainly, is more fitted to state to the world the griefs of the Catholic Church in this matter than Dupanloup, the Bishop of Orleans. His fitness for this task is of the first order. Ardently devoted to the cause of the Pope and the Catholic Church, he stands above every other ecclesiastic in France in those popular gifts and talents that are desirable and essential in an efficient, prominent advocate of the Church of Rome. His gifts of mind and speech have constituted him, by the common consent of his party, and in real power, the clerical leader and advocate in all that concerns the interests of the Catholic Church in the National Assembly at Versailles. He is a prolific writer, is very fluent and eloquent in speech, and wields a ready pen. But the impassioned, partisan zeal always shows itself in his speeches and writings, when he is playing the advocate of his Church against what he considers her enemies, in spite of the evident desire and effort always to maintain the polished manners of a scholar and ecclesiastic of high position; his zeal and passion are pre-eminently those of a thorough Catholic. This "Letter to M. Minghetti" is every way as complete a characteristic of M. Dupanloup as any thing we have ever had from him, spoken or written. The name of the advocate assures us that this grievance of "the Church" against the Italian Government is here set forth in its strongest light.

To believe M. Dupanloup's "Letter," the "outrages" committed by the Government of Italy on "the Church" have been of the most extreme and violent kind, utterly regardless of all principles of law and justice. We can easily conceive of the effect of this impassioned document on the minds of partial and uninformed Catholics. The two documents we are noticing constitute an instructive study, and teach us a very salutary lesson as regards the spirit and manner of Catholic writers, and the controversies which Catholicism has with the world. After we have read the "Answer" to the Bishop's "Letter," we are filled with amazement at the misrepresentations, often extreme, in the "Letter," from the beginning to the end of it, and we learn how to estimate the correctness and candor of Catholic writers in cases of this kind. A few illustrations from these two *brochures* must suffice. One of the most impassioned chapters in the "Letter" is that which treats of the "Spoliations," by the Italian laws, of the "pious foundations"

which the Catholic nations have at Rome—that is, the religious establishments of various kinds munificently supported by Catholic nations in the Holy City.

“Who does not know, sir,” says the Bishop to M. Minghetti, “that Rome is the common country of all Catholics? ‘This Rome,’ Montaigne said, ‘deserves to be loved—confederate so long and in so many ways with the French crown; it is the common and metropolitan city of all Christian nations; the Spaniard and the Frenchman—each one is there at home. To be a prince of this State, it is only necessary to belong to Christendom, wherever it may be. There is no place on this earth which heaven has loaded with such great and such constant favors.’”

With eloquence he then enumerates the “pious establishments” of the French in Rome, and the sacrificing devotion of their inmates, the devoted “Lazarists,” “the valiant Trappists,” etc., etc.; and then culminates by stating the “outrage” committed on these.

“And these French *establishments*, first of all, you have visited with enormous taxes. They paid, under Pius IX, 11,500 francs—now 28,000, almost three times as great; and they are threatened with a tax of 34,000 francs!”

“But this is not all:—all these foreign foundations, pious establishments, and communities, you desire also to subject to a forced sale, and, as a right of transfer, to take from them thirty per cent of their value.”

To this the “Answer” replies, by quoting *Article XX* of the law passed June 19, 1873, which declares that,

“The extraordinary tax (of thirty per cent) imposed by Article XVIII of the law of the 15th of August, 1867, is not applicable to the sale of the property and possessions of religious corporations in the city of Rome and its suburban dioceses.”

“This text is clear, positive. No one would venture, in any intelligent circle at Rome, to say that the tax of thirty per cent is applied in Rome in any form or in any manner whatever. The error of M. Dupanloup is palpable.”

The most stupendous blunders are, for some reasons or other, committed by the Bishop on this question of “spoliation.”

The sales of ecclesiastical property, is really only a very salutary change in the *condition* of such property, from the old *main-morte* to what is infinitely better and more in harmony with the present forms of the tenure of property. The Bishop complains, with the Catholic zealots, that this change has brought upon the possessors of this kind of property “enormous losses.” In reply the “Answer” states:

“How erroneous are these predictions of ‘enormous losses,’ can be judged from the following indications from the sales thus far made at Rome and in the Campagna. To the present, eleven sales have occurred. Establishments in the city, to an amount valued at 1,099,000 francs, have brought 1,819,000. Lands in the *Cantienne* (outside the walls) of Rome, valued at 446,000 francs, have brought 686,000. Several large farms (*tenute*), valued at 3,789,000 francs, have yielded 4,440,000. Thus these sales have given an increase of 700,000 francs for the city property; 250,000 for the lands; for the large farms, 650,000,—total a gain of 1,600,000 francs.”

M. Dupanloup says all this property has been "confiscated." All this is false. The original possessors have the benefit of the whole of it; it has been all very profitably invested for them, and the entire transaction has been a large gain to them.

Of the famous *Roman College*, the Bishop complains, "You have taken the twelve thousand crowns assigned to the professors of the Roman College by the Pontifical government." The "Answer" says: "The Italian Government has taken away nothing. It has expended, as is well known, *more than twelve thousand crowns* for the several purposes of the college,—for its chairs of instruction, its observatory, its museum, and the faculty of theology of the foreign colleges."

As a final specimen of the *sad stories* of the wrongs of the Church which the Bishop reports to the world, we give what he says concerning the "spoliation" of the Church of St. Dominic of Bologna:

"Have I not read in the Italian journals that at Bologna, in spite of Article 24 of your law of July 7, 1866, there was sold at public sale all the furniture of the Church of St. Dominic—chasubles, busts of the saints, the holy vases themselves?"

Such an extreme outrage on every principle of law and justice as this certainly would draw on the Italian Government the reprobation of the world, if it were true. Fortunately, the entire statement is false. The "Answer" states:

"If any journal printed this story, it was badly informed. When, on the 28th October, 1872, the Administration of Church Property ceded the Church of St. Dominic to the municipality of Bologna, it delivered over to the rector of the Church all the holy objects in it, of which absolutely nothing was sold, under any form, neither by public sale nor otherwise.

"This simply was done: In agreement with the rector, a valuation was made of these objects, in which they were put at 22,083 francs. Was it this valuation, which was necessary for the responsibility of the rector, that was denounced as a public sale?"

In fact, it is clear, after reading both of these documents, that the series of griefs, set forth so eloquently by M. Dupanloup, are, all of them, either exaggerations, misrepresentations by giving but part of the truth, or wholly false. Such, we are sure, has been the treatment of this Italian question by Catholic writers in the interests of the Papacy.

3.—*La Littérature Française au Dix-Neuvième Siècle.* Par J. P. CHARPENTIER, *Inspecteur Honoraire de l'Académie de Paris, Agrégé à la Faculté des Lettres.* (French Literature in the Nineteenth Century. By J. P. CHARPENTIER, Honorary Inspector of the Academy of Paris, and Fellow of the Faculty of Letters.) Paris: Garnier Brothers. 12mo. pp. 370. 1875.

FRANCE, since the civilization and enlightenment of Western Europe, has always stood in the front rank as a cultivator of literature, the arts and the sciences; in the earlier centuries of the modern age she stood even

ahead of great England, and long—up to a comparative late date—far in advance of Germany, that now towers up so high in her literary renown. France for a long time held up the torch to the other Western nations of Europe; England early was her noblest rival and peer. In literature, for several centuries past, France has had an illustrious record, and her heavens are studded with a starry host of names of the first magnitude. Revolutions, great disasters, can not break her great power of mind, or darken the radiant brightness of her spirit. Adverse circumstances may, for a brief period, repress her intellectual and spiritual power, but only for a moment. The giant will rise again, like Samson, and shake off the fetters with which tyranny had thought to bind him. The enlightened world knows and acknowledges the debt the nations owe to France for what she has done and is doing in enlightening the world.

It is very interesting to know what France has done in the wide domain of literature during the eventful periods of the present century—our own immediate age. The book of Charpentier, beginning with the Empire, gives us a consecutive history of French literature in all its departments, to the present period. Not many names of note are omitted, and the notices are as full as the limits of the volume will allow, and the criticisms generally are just. It is always a difficult and delicate task to judge with freedom, candor, and impartiality, the men of our day and times. We know and can judge men better, when time has removed them some distance from us, and their names and their labors have ripened by age into the full maturity of their real worth. We know, alas, too well, that the books written too soon, concerning men that have flourished in any prominence, are very often far from reliable. Every such book, therefore, as Charpentier's, must be received with much allowance. It would be wonderful, indeed, if no errors of judgment had crept into it. Yet it is pleasant to see that a desire and spirit of candor and impartiality pervades the entire book. We can allow ourselves space only for a few extracts.

In the valuable *Introduction*, the writer very properly passes in brief review the spirit and character of the literature of the age preceding our own. His *appreciations* here given are just and valuable. We are tempted to quote a passage here, and commend it earnestly to the reader:

"Every literary age," says the writer, "however independent and creative it may be, depends more or less on the age that has preceded it. The nineteenth century is no exception to this law; it is the child of the eighteenth century.

"If the nineteenth century proceeds from the eighteenth, the eighteenth is not the direct heir of the seventeenth. Aside from the literary traditions to which it remained faithful, it separates itself completely from the age that preceded it; it comes from the sixteenth century; it takes this up again and continues it; it attaches itself to the Reformation and to Calvin, to Rabelais and to Montaigne. But it is especially in philosophy, in politics, in history, and even in criticism, that it breaks with the age of Louis Fourteenth.

"Descartes and Malebranche had made the science of the soul the text and the inspi-

ration of their researches; the philosophers of the eighteenth century banished it from their systems; or, if at times they consented to admit it, it was only as a principle of life, a neutral faculty attached by bonds yet unknown to a certain assemblage of matter. They no longer occupied themselves with any thing except the necessary relations of man with external objects, and with the influence of his physical organization. This metaphysical theory came from England. Locke was the first that had given it to the world, but with more reserve. He had, it is true, given to sensations a large part in the formation of ideas, in the mechanism of the human understanding, but he had not made of it the entire essence of man. The Encyclopedists drew from the principles of Locke the consequences from which he himself would have recoiled, but which, after all, were contained in them. Voltaire, in his 'English Letters,' initiated us into those theories which Condillac was to perfect and popularize. Without doubt, Condillac no more than Locke, intended to arrive at the negation of the soul, but this negation was, in spite of him, contained in his system; and do what he would, he could not bring activity out of passivity, or mind out of sensation.

"The disastrous consequences of the system of sensation were born out of it so irresistibly that a man who would attempt to draw other conclusions from it—as Charles Bonnet, who devoted a whole life to harmonize this theory with the moral nature—could never succeed in the attempt. Unknown to him, and in spite of him, sensation triumphs over and crushes out the divine essence of the soul. Spiritualist in his thought and in his aim, Bonnet often, without intending it, borders on materialism."

The English-speaking world, to our own day, has reaped the evil harvest of Locke's system of sensation. It had, to our own day, a wide currency, and became a part of the creeds of men, even of their religious creeds, and Christ and Paul were expounded according to Locke. These refined, religious, materialistic ideas have done the religious world incalculable evil, the end of which is not yet. It is painful to know and to have witnessed how often the most weighty and spiritual passages and truths of the New Testament were passed through the destructive crucible of the sensation philosophy, their divine spiritual essence destroyed, and so wholly materialized. God grant that this evil day may have ended, when the spirituality of the religion of Christ was interpreted by and passed through human philosophy, and above all the philosophy of sensation! Well was it for the religion and faith of many, that, by a blessed inconsequence, the inconsequence of ignorance often, they preserved their faith in spite of their philosophical guides and notions—their religion was stronger than their philosophy.

Charpentier pronounced a very favorable judgment on De Tocqueville, the author of "Democracy in America:"

"The very first effort of M. de Tocqueville, placed him, in the public opinion, in a rank above which he has never since risen. When, in 1835, his work on 'Democracy in America,' appeared, M. Royer Collard said that, 'since Montesquieu, he had not seen any thing like it.' In 1836 the French Academy decreed an extraordinary price to this work, which according to the expression of M. Villemain, who brought in the report on it, 'left him no hope of often crowning works equal to this.'"

We have only space left for a passage in which the three great contemporary orators, Guizot, Thiers, and Berryer, are compared:

"M. Guizot was not born an orator—even at the Sorbonne (where he was Professor), his language was far from having the facility and the brilliancy of M. Villemain, the anima-

tion of M. Cousin—but he became one. The eloquence which M. Guizot displayed upward on the tribune is certainly the most striking illustration of the words of Quintilian, *Fiunt oratores*. 'When in the Chamber, M. Guizot was in the midst of parties; when he had the governmental power to defend, public opinion to persuade, his language became by degrees clearer, more accurate, and more powerful; it seemed that every day brought a progress. When at the end of 1840, after he had really become a Prime Minister, he had the whole weight of public affairs, and had to face all, and had to repel at all points the attacks of adversaries as formidable as Berryer and Thiers, men saw, with a surprise which may be called admiration, the orator grow greater every day; every day acquiring a new gift, a new quality, and in the midst of the fiercest heats of the battle arriving almost at perfection.' Thus M. E. Lerminier expresses himself. M. Sainte-Beuve said that M. Guizot was not born a writer; that he had sharpened his stylus on the marble of eloquence; he had sharpened his language there much more.

"The rival parliamentary orator of M. Guizot, M. Thiers, is also the opposite of him. In proportion as the one is always like himself, imposing and majestic, the other is ever pliant, lively, undulating. For a long time richly copious, finally orator, M. Thiers has grown throughout his long, varied parliamentary phases. At the opening of his public career, he revealed only a mind open to every question, especially to financial questions, and for a long time his chief talent was to seize them with promptitude and to develop them with clearness and precision. Eloquence was scarcely manifested by him till the day when, thrown among the Opposition, he delivered his speech on *the incompatibilities*, on the word *corruption*. 'Are we then to be reduced to have only the fiction of a representative government, when others have the reality? Ah! we ought to have been told this in 1830!' He spoke against the admission; I heard him, and I confess that, in spite of the enthusiasm his words excited in the tribunes, if I appreciated him, I was not yet carried away by him.

"The Second Empire did not at first find M. Thiers superior to what he had been under the Government of July; but now, free from personal ambition and guided by patriotism, perhaps also by a feeling of resentment, he had a political clearness of vision which gave to his words an authority, a weight, and an elevation, which had hitherto been wanting in him. However, with these new advantages, he was not yet really eloquent; his strong side was yet his first science—the science of the budgets, of finances.

"Fortune reserved for him a supreme, a final consecration. M. Sainte-Beuve had said, 'M. Thiers had elevated familiar talking to the height of eloquence.' No! when M. Sainte-Beuve said this, it was not absolutely true; since Bordeaux, since Versailles, it has become so. He was better than eloquent; he has spoken with the simplicity, the good sense, the impartiality, of a statesman, of a good citizen, except, perhaps, that he gave a little too much prominence to his personality. It is not a bad thing that an orator should put himself forward in the scene; and this is one of the most powerful means of acting on the auditors; but he must not do this too much; this was, in his later times, the rock on which M. Thiers was wrecked.

"If we compare M. Guizot with M. Thiers, we might say, that M. Thiers was perfected in renewing himself; by giving more attention than M. Guizot to the interest, to the passions, of the moment, he exercised a greater influence on the minds of men, and gained more success on the tribune; but he detracted somewhat from the future merit of his eloquence. M. Guizot lost less than he by being read, by taking pains to keep in reserve, as did Demosthenes and Cicero, and put in his discourses, certain lessons of morality or of political considerations, which are the most solid foundation of eloquence. . . .

"As for M. Berryer, he had, toward his end, that gracefulness and also that power which years give to the orator; but we might say that, properly speaking, his eloquence did not arrive at full maturity. He was always equal to himself, and superior to M. Guizot and M. Thiers.

"From political eloquence to judicial eloquence, M. Berryer is a natural transition—king at the bar as on the tribune. We shall not speak of the triumphs which he carried off at the Palace of Justice, where he displayed, in the measure which the difference of the causes and of the place demanded, his great qualities of an able advocate."